Doctoral Dissertations												Graduate School

8-2010

Humility: Development and analysis of a scale

Jeffrey Charles Elliott
University of Tennessee, jelliot5@utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss

Part of the Other Psychology Commons

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Jeffrey Charles Elliott entitled "Humility: Development and analysis of a scale." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

Kathleen Row, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Lowell Gaertner, Eric Sundstrom, Sandra Thomas

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Jeffrey Charles Elliott entitled "Humility: Development and Analysis of a Scale." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

                                Kathleen Row, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Eric Sundstrom

Lowell Gaertner

Sandra Thomas

                        Accepted for the Council:

                        Carolyn R. Hodges
                        Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Humility: Development and Analysis of a Scale

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jeffrey Charles Elliott

August 2010

DEDICATION

To the most important people in my life: my wife, Penny, and children,

Jessica, Janette, and Aaron.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Abstract

Humility is widely accepted as a character strength or virtue, yet very little research has been done as to its development or benefits, partly due to the lack of a reliable and valid explicit measure or scale. Since to date no such scale has been published, the current study investigates the importance and nature of dispositional humility and develops a measure to be analyzed as to its reliability and validity. Potential scale items were derived from participants' recollection of humbling experiences and Tangney's (2000) definition of humility. Principal components analysis revealed four humility subscales: openness, self-forgetfulness, accurate self-assessment, and focus on others. Results suggest that the derived 13-item scale has good concurrent and divergent validity, and that three of the four principal components have acceptable reliability. Researchers can use information from the Humility scale to better understand how it relates to other concepts of positive psychology and how increasing humility might be advantageous to interpersonal relationships.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The last 20 years have seen a growing interest in the study of psychological health and wellness. The positive psychology movement has focused attention on the qualities of healthy and hardy persons that seemingly cause them to enjoy greater subjective well-being. This desire to better understand what human virtues or character strengths are related to greater psychological health is the motivating source for this dissertation.

Humility is considered by many to be a desired character strength, but at the same time is often synonymous with negatively perceived concepts such as subservience, abasement, and meekness. This has made humility a difficult concept to measure; yet if its importance as a character strength is to be understood, then a reliable, valid instrument will be necessary for further research.

Not only is humility itself worthy of study as a character strength in the field of positive psychology, but its theoretical linkage with healthy interpersonal relationships (Exline, 2008) and as a precursor to forgiveness (Sandage, 1997) adds greater impetus to its importance in promoting healthy, interpersonal relationships. Many in the field of positive psychology suggest that dynamic, interpersonal relationships are one of the foundational tenets for psychological well-being. It has also been established that being able to forgive oneself and others is a prerequisite to thriving, despite the inevitable bumps and bruises of relating in this world.

This dissertation asserts that, based on the importance of humility as a virtue, and its possible relationship with forgiveness in promoting healthy interpersonal relationships, a measure of humility is greatly needed to further research in both these

growing fields. This study proposes a way to establish such a measure, and then to test its reliability and validity.

One of the oldest pursuits of humankind has been the search for happiness, personal fulfillment, and well-being. This endeavor to discover the "good life" has followed a myriad of paths, as varied as the peoples, cultures, and societies of the world. For some, this search focused on aspects of sensuality, intimacy, and physical delights. Others have pursued emotional facets of humanness, such as love and laughter, as the means to contentment. Still others have sought to achieve the actualization of happiness and fulfillment through a relationship with a "higher authority," "greater purpose" or a calling that asks them to rise above themselves. The differences in these pursuits, and the difficulty in defining what constitutes the "good life," provide fertile ground for investigation.

Positive psychology

Positive psychology has arisen as a field of study within psychology over the past two decades, with the goal of systematically and scientifically carrying out an investigation of well-being (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Positive psychology challenges the idea that psychology is only the study of pathology, weakness, and damage, arguing that it must also strive to understand virtue and strength (Snyder & McCullough, 2000). It confronts the notion that treatment is only about fixing the broken, by urging the nurturance of what is best (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Generally, positive psychology focuses on three broad areas of human experience. The first and most widely researched area of positive psychology has been the positive emotions of subjective well-being where happiness, love, satisfaction with life, and

contentment have been studied (Diener, 1984; Diener, Suh, Lucas & Smith 1999; Myers, 2000; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1997). Positive subjective states seem to be the result of a complex mix of external events and background conditions mediated by a person's values and goals (Diener, 2000).

Positive psychology also focuses on the development and maintenance of positive institutions. At this group or societal level, positive psychology has studied issues such as the cultivation of civic values, aspects of healthy families, and what constitutes healthy, work environments (Compton, 2001). This area is just beginning to seek answers to factors in positive institutions that are associated with better mental and physical health.

Lastly, positive psychology focuses on the study of positive individual traits, including what has historically been referred to as character strengths or virtues. In the past decade, it has been the investigation of these character strengths, their development and maintenance, as well as the potency of their effectiveness, that has caught the research attention of psychologists. Individual differences in subjective well-being are more closely related to differing personal traits and strengths than to differences in external events or life situation. The strongest predictors of subjective well-being are (1) positive self-esteem, (2) sense of perceived control, (3) extroversion, (4) optimism, (5) positive social relationships, and (6) sense of purpose in life (Myers, 1992; Diener et al., 1999). While all six of these characteristics are important concepts individually, they often interact synergistically to bring happiness to life. For instance, high self-esteem, perceived control, optimism, and sense of life purpose are traits of a person who has achieved, at least in a relative sense, emotional stability. Since happier persons tend to have positive social relationships and often are more extroverted, this suggests they have

achieved a measure of equilibrium with others. When these two ideas are brought together, people with greater subjective well-being have formed a way to successfully balance meeting their own needs with the needs of others in their sphere of life.

Within the framework of a scientific positive psychology, there has been an increased call for greater research into how the various aspects of humanness affect individuals' subjective well-being (Myers, 2000; Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2004; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The study of which character strengths relate to greater subjective well-being, and how they seemingly affect these positive outcomes has proven to be a fruitful endeavor. This ongoing research has required the delineation of what constitutes a virtue or character strength, as well as being able to adequately define it, both conceptually and operationally.

Humility

Humility may be accepted as a virtue by most psychologists (Exline & Geyer, 2004), yet when it comes to an agreed upon definition, or actual empirical research on the assessment or benefits of humility there are few scientific data. Humility has been considered to be an important component of personal and interpersonal life outcomes (Emmons, 1999; Sandage, 1997; Sandage & Wiens, 2001; Worthington, 1998.) In the health field, a lack of humility or the excessive self-focus associated with narcissistic tendencies is a risk factor for coronary heart disease (Scherwitz & Canick, 1988). In interpersonal relations, humility and empathy provide a way to resolve conflicts by making it more likely for there to be forgiveness and reconciliation. As a part of forgiveness, humility may provide the offended party with a cognitive framework to understand his/her own past need for forgiveness, making him/her more likely to

reciprocate. Many religious traditions (Chittister, 1991) also value humility as a spiritually mature characteristic. Pride and selfishness are often discouraged in various religions, while humility is an attribute that is considered to be highly prized. In both how religious followers are to relate to their God, as well as how they are to relate with others, humility provides a framework of self-understanding and self-control that may provide a framework to an improved life. As it relates to their spirituality, this increased self-understanding and self-control will allow them to better monitor their own struggles, as well as be aware of their reactions to their God and to the people around them.

Tangney (2002) suggests two factors leading to the neglect of humility as a research topic. The first is humility's connection to religious values. In general, psychology has been hesitant to investigate virtues too closely tied to religious values for fear they are beyond or not worthy of scientific study. Even though humility is valued by most world religions, it is not solely a virtue limited to the realm of religion. It is an important attribute of all human relationships. Yet, even if it were only a "religious" concept, it is still worthy of understanding its place among religious followers. Secondly, the study of humility has been limited by the lack of a well-established measure. Furthermore, the measurement of humility as a virtue is hampered by its association with feelings of shame, guilt, and humiliation. These feelings are not associated with positive outcomes, therefore providing an additional challenge to scale validity.

Humility defined

For some people, humility may not be accepted as a virtuous quality at all. To them, humility conjures up images of a cowering servant, who has accepted his lowly status in society. For others, humility may be a characteristic of one who constantly

5

disparages his or her lack of personal skills and abilities. Neither of these portrayals of

humility satisfactorily defines the healthy quality of humility. It is probably this

misunderstanding of humility that has kept many in the field of psychology from being

interested in its study. Humility is not about viewing oneself negatively, nor is it about

self-deprecation (Tangney, 2000); humility as a virtue is also not the same as humiliation.

Tangney (2000), in her signature work on humility, defined it as including:

- An accurate assessment of one's abilities and achievements;

- The ability to acknowledge one's mistakes, imperfections, gaps in
knowledge, and limitations;

- An openness to new ideas, contradictory information, and advice;

- A keeping of one's abilities and accomplishments–one's place in
the world–in perspective;

- A relatively low self-focus, a "forgetting of the self", while
recognizing that one is but one part of the larger universe;

- An appreciation of the many different ways that people and things
can contribute to our world.

Emmons (1999) proposed that being humble does not mean holding a low opinion of

oneself, but rather is having an accurate self-assessment. Templeton (1997) submitted

that the opposite of humility is arrogance, and that true humility promotes an openness to

learning from others and a building of community. So it would seem that humble persons

neither think too highly nor too lowly of themselves, but practice self-forgetfulness.

Humility is not thinking poorly of oneself, but rather not focusing on oneself to the

6

neglect of another. Thus, humility leaves them more open to acknowledging the abilities and worth of others.

Probably the greatest confusion concerning humility involves its association with low self-esteem. Instead of de-valuing one's abilities, or minimizing one's contributions, the truly humble person accepts the fact he/she has strengths *and* weaknesses. In fact, humility has much more in common with high self-esteem, while arrogance is more similar to low self-esteem (Ryan, 1983). Arrogance and low self-esteem lead one to evaluate life experiences in terms of their effect on self, while humility and high self-esteem have no urgency to deny praiseworthy achievements and no need to protect the self against criticism. Accurately understanding one's abilities, as well as the special qualities of others, frees a person to evaluate the self and others honestly (Buri, 1988). The confusion of low self-esteem with humility (Roberts, 1983) may be the outcome of viewing humility as caused by limited talents or repeated failures. In reality, for persons to be able to be humble concerning their accomplishments, they must have first succeeded at or mastered something. Humility allows this person to have achieved an accomplishment of worth yet not feel the necessity to express arrogance or boast of their achievement. As previously defined, humble persons do not necessarily possess low self-esteem, or look down on themselves, but rather have an accurate self-assessment. In fact, persons who engage in self-deprecation may exhibit a false humility, one that is utilized to manipulate others into giving them what they want: attention and adulation. Humility is not thinking negatively of self, but rather thinking less often of self and one's own personal needs (Ryan, 1983), which allows the humble person to be available to be cognizant of the needs of others. So humility is not the opposite of high self-esteem, nor

is it shown by the presence of low self-esteem. Humble persons do not think less of themselves, but rather think of themselves less.

As a result of an accurate self-assessment, humble persons are then able to acknowledge their inferiority to others in some areas, and able to accept their own superiority over others in other areas (Roberts, 1983). Humility is an expression of a deep self-acceptance, because there is no internal need to prove oneself over another. This allows humble persons to possess a teachable spirit, whereby they admit their mistakes and gaps in knowledge, and then are open to receiving the new ideas and wise counsel of the superior other (Tangney, 2002). Humble persons understand that mistakes are a part of the human experience, and are open to accepting the help needed to make corrections. This is another connection between humility and most world religions, as both would encourage the importance of mutual interdependence, whether among communities or individuals.

The final aspect necessary in grasping the concept of humility is the requirement of a universal perspective. At some level, persons with humility accept the absolute equality of humankind (Roberts, 1983). Humble persons have a down-to-earth perspective of themselves and the events and relationships in their lives (Vera & Rodriquez-Lopez, 2004). This perspective allows them to view success, failure, work, and life without exaggeration. By having an enlarged perspective, humble persons develop a sense of self-forgetfulness and self-transcendence (Exline, Campbell, Baumeister, Joiner, & Krueger, 2004b). This letting go of self is accompanied by a connection to a greater reality. For some people, this means looking at self in contrast to an omnipotent God, or a stronger, naturally-occurring wonder (Exline et al, 2004b).

Humility implies a basic awareness of one's relationship to the world and a connectedness to all its circumstances. For the religious, it is an admission of God's gifts to them, and an acknowledgment that they have been given them for the benefit of others (Chittister, 1991). For others, it may mean honestly facing and accepting their vulnerabilities in life before the forces of nature and time (Sandage & Wiens, 2001). Either way, humility seems to require a self-transcendent perspective, not to cause one to sink into an abyss of inadequacy or inferiority, but rather to encourage one into a basic connection with another. Believing that others have personal value and worth, humble persons accept others (Roberts, 1983).

Humility may be most noticeable when it is displayed by those who have the greatest cause to be prideful. Persons who have accomplished much in their area of expertise are often recognized by their peers for their accomplishments, but what is most impressive are those who continue to produce great feats, yet do so without fanfare or seeking praise or self-promotion. The opposite could also be said to be true. No one is impressed with the humility of the loser or the one who has failed, for he has nothing of which to boast, but it is the gracious, humble winner or the humble success story that is more greatly admired.

Benefits of humility

As of now, it cannot be said, based on empirical data, that humility has confirmed psychological or social benefits. With no theory-based, reliable, and valid measure, humility's effects must be gleaned from a review of related literature (Exline, 2008; Tangney, 2000). Exclusionary sources will be examined to study the effects of what

9

humility is not, in order to discover humility's possible social, psychological, and physiological effects.

An excessive self-focus, as exhibited in the trait of narcissism is a risk factor for coronary heart disease (Scherwitz & Canick, 1988; Worthington & Scherer, 2004). Individuals with higher narcissism scores have greater difficulty establishing and maintaining healthy interpersonal relationships. Humble people are not preoccupied with maintaining inflated self-views, so would be less likely to react angrily toward others who might threaten or confront their self-views (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). In contrast to conventional wisdom, defensively high self-esteem, not low self-esteem, is linked to more violent behaviors (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996). If the humble truly are able to acknowledge their mistakes, and accept their successes appropriately and accurately, then they will not need to expend physical or psychological energy defending or glorifying themselves. They will possess a certain level of inner peace, yet not allow it to become an apathetic acceptance of the status quo.

While humility would seem to yield positive intrapersonal effects, probably its greatest impact would be on one's interpersonal relations. Because humble people are not seeking social dominance, they are more willing to learn from others and compliment others in their accomplishments (Exline, 2008). If as theorized humility helps people to supersede self-interest, it should be associated with increased levels of forgiveness, repentance, and compassion. Humility has already been shown to be an important prerequisite for many models of forgiveness (Emmons, 1999; Enright, 2001; Sandage, 1997; Worthington, 2006). As defined previously, humble persons are able to admit their mistakes and imperfections. They understand they are only parts of the whole, and so

10

they do not sense the same egocentric concerns as do the prideful. In the midst of an interpersonal conflict, the humble person's willingness to acknowledge flaws appears especially beneficial in promoting the seeking and giving of forgiveness (Means, Wilson, Sturm, & Biron, 1990; Sandage, Worthington, Hight, & Berry, 2000.) So, rather than a defense of self and a resulting argument between two self-serving egos, humble persons recognize their potential share of responsibility for the conflict and endeavor to learn from it in order to correct their mistakes. When forgiving an offender, those who exhibit the trait of humility understand their own propensity for wrong-doing, and this decreases their perception of injustice by seeing themselves as less innocent and their offenders as less evil (Exline, Worthington, Hill, & McCullough, 2003). In contrast, narcissistic persons are preoccupied with advancing and protecting their personal interests, which hinders their participation in seeking and granting forgiveness (Sandage et al., 2000). Baumeister and Exline (1999) have suggested that humans need to belong, and need to be in relationships; certainly, a humble attitude would seem to make healthy, vibrant interpersonal relationships more likely.

Not only does humility seem to offer benefits for close, familial relationships, it can also strengthen and sustain other types of relationships, such as those at work, in religious, and social organizations, and in leadership roles. Many socially problematic actions involve self-control failures, yet the trait of being humble would include a fairly high and effective rate of self-control (Baumeister & Exline, 1999). Prideful people are self-focused; they are less likely to contribute to the group or organization's welfare, or to be willing to put themselves out for the good of others. Humble persons are more other-focused, and thus would be more cognizant of others' needs and would be naturally

11

drawn to respond positively in meeting those needs (Kunz, 2002). They would not impose their assistance, but make it readily available. In a work setting, humility is demonstrated by a willingness to learn, to respond positively to negative feedback, and to listen to others, not only acknowledging their concerns, but also recognizing and respecting their good ideas (Reave, 2005). Most world religions recognize humility as a virtue, and attempt to encourage their followers to surrender selfish ambitions, while considering the needs of others above their own (Sandage & Wiens, 2001). Ideally, this selflessness and others-focus would increase the communal benefits of the respective institution and also increase its appeal to outsiders.

One particular area of interest where humility would seem to play an important part is in professional counseling and psychotherarpy (Jennings, Sovereign, Bottorff, Mussell, & Vye, 2005; Means et al., 1990; Zausner, 2003). Not only could humility be employed as a counseling intervention to promote forgiveness and improve interpersonal relations (as described above), but should also be a part of the ethical training of therapists and counselors (Jennings et al., 2005). Particularly important is humility's emphasis on understanding and accepting one's limitations. This quality may keep professional helpers oriented toward learning and growth, as opposed to developing an unhealthy professional arrogance. Humility would also assist them in restraining their ego involvement and subjectivity (Zausner, 2003). When counselors share therapeutic insights or employ counseling interventions, it would be most helpful if they did so with humility, allowing the counselees to grasp the role of their choices in accepting or declining the offered assistance.

Assessment of humility

Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) urged psychologists not only to accept the importance of positive psychology, but also to apply the rigors of scientific methodology to better understanding its components. One of the primary functions of positive psychology is the study of human strengths and virtues, of which humility is generally accepted as one. That presents a challenge for the development of tools to measure humility and for research into its real-world consequences (Emmons & Paloutzian, 2003). Until such an instrument exists, humility's effects will have to be inferred indirectly.

As a result of an increased interest in virtues and positive psychology, the definition of humility has been discussed and debated, but attempts to assess humility have proven much more difficult (Tangney, 2000; Exline et al., 2004b; Exline & Geyer, 2004). At this time, no reliable, valid measure that focuses specifically on trait humility has been published. Attempts to create self-report inventories covering humility have so far yielded low reliabilities and lacked validity (Exline, 2008; Tangney, 2000.) One difficulty in assessing humility is the result of divergent opinions on a precise understanding of humility. In addition, self-report inventories of humility have struggled with social desirability response sets. After all, if one expresses high levels of self-reported humility, could he/she truly be humble? That would seem to suggest a mind-set of "I am humble, and proud of it!" Or do humble persons realize their own humility? Is humility unidimensional or multidimensional in nature? These questions, as well as others have so far hindered the development of a dispositional humility scale.

As stated previously, the non-existence of humility measures is not solely due to lack of effort (Exline, 2008; Tangney, 2000). The self-denying nature of humility makes

it difficult, and perhaps impossible, to assess unambiguously with self-report inventories (Kunz, 2002). It would also seem implausible that one who strives to accurately assess his/her abilities and achievements would be likely to feel they have done so completely accurately. It may be that any future measure must take a different approach than what has been used for measuring other psychological constructs.

Since humility is hard to measure by its presence, some have proposed assessing it based on what it is not (Exline, Baumeister, Bushman, Campbell, & Finkel, 2004a). One example of this strategy measures narcissism. According to Exline et al., (2004a) narcissism is primarily characterized by a grandiose and inflated sense of self. Narcissists score high on measures of competitiveness (Watson, Morris, & Miller, 1997), dominance (Emmons, 1984), and superiority (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). These characteristics of narcissism would seem to be the antithesis of humility, as previously defined. However, while humility may be inversely related to narcissism, how low should one's narcissism score be before he/she is considered humble? Furthermore, humility as related to self-esteem, self-confidence and self-transcendence, is more than low levels of narcissism. Thus, this research question remains unanswered, and demonstrates the basic flaw of trying to assess one characteristic based on its absence or the presence of its presumed opposite.

As it is with many psychological constructs, humility could be measured at both the situational and dispositional levels. In this early stage of understanding, researchers are more interested in assessing stable, individual differences in humility. As stated previously, presently no such instrument exists, but, if developed, it would not only assist in measuring humility's relative presence or absence, it would also permit

14

examination of potential associations with dimensions of psychological and physical health (Tangney, 2000).

A recent study by Exline and Geyer (2004) induced a sense of humility experimentally, by asking participants to write about a personal experience when they had felt humble. They were then asked to describe the situation and the emotions they experienced while in the situation. Then they evaluated the extent to which the memory was pleasant to recall. The findings demonstrated that most people (61%) recalled experiences involving success or an accomplishment, rather than an incident of humiliation (24%). Also, in contrast to the perceived negative view of humility, Exline and Geyer (2004) found consistently positive views of humility, in general, and of humble persons, in particular. Though the participants did see humility as a strength, they also believed it was a characteristic more suitable for certain types of people (e.g., religious leaders, personal friends, subordinates) than for others (e.g., political leaders or entertainers).

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The dearth of empirical research on humility is staggering, considering it has been proposed as an important character strength (Worthington, 2008) for more than two decades (Roberts, 1983). The following studies are indicative of the direction of the most recent research. The first study (Exline & Geyer, 2004), is included due to its influence in the development of the current humility measure. The researchers employed open-ended questions for better understanding people's perceptions of humility. The second (Rowatt, Ottenbreit, Nesselroade, Jr., & Cunningham, 2002) and third (Rowatt, Powers, Targhetta, Comer, Kennedy, & Labouf, 2006) studies are related attempts at measuring humility using implicit methods. They are included because they are representative of the few attempts of assessing dispositional humility. Modesty is often associated with humility and the fourth study (Gregg, Hart, Sedikides, and Kumashiro, 2008) is a recent attempt of its measurement. It shows the proper method of defining an abstract concept, and since modesty is a related concept to humility, their attempt at measuring it provides insight into the present study's development of a humility scale. Another related concept is self-compassion. The fifth review is that of an article by Neff (2003) that presents the development and validation of the Self-Compassion Scale. Self-compassion involves being touched by one's own suffering, experiencing feelings of care and kindness toward oneself, taking an understanding, nonjudgmental attitude toward one's own failures, and recognizing one's own personal experience in light of the common human experience. The final (Ashton, Lee, Perugini, Szarota, de Vries, Di Blas, Boies, and De Raad, 2004) review is a representative study of the recent interest in humility as a possible sixth

16

personality trait. Though the present study does not investigate humility as a personality trait, the Ashton et al. (2004) study has been followed-up with additional supportive research for humility being a dispositional personality trait.

Perceptions of humility

Is humility a character strength or a sign of weakness? This is the question posed by Exline and Geyer (2004) in their study of the perceptions of humility. The common definition given of humility (Tangney, 2002) often associates it with humiliation, low self-esteem, and self-abasement. Yet many religious and philosophical traditions (Chittister, 1991) suggest that humility is a highly-valued virtue.

On the positive side, it would seem reasonable that humble people would be more likely to make interpersonal adjustments based on their sense of self-security, an accurate view of self, and a non-defensive, openness to self-limitations. These qualities should lend themselves toward greater likeability and favorable interpersonal relationships. On the other hand, because humility involves the willingness to accept one's shortcomings, people may associate humility with detrimental costs in a competitive, individualistic culture.

Exline and Geyer (2004) sought to examine people's perceptions of humility, and whether it was valued as a trait in all types of people. They were also interested in whether individual differences in religiosity, narcissism, and self-esteem might be relevant to perceptions of humility. Participants for this study were 127 introductory psychology students, about equally divided between men (61) and women (66), from a private Midwestern university, with an average age of 18.9. The sample was 77% Caucasian, 19% Asian, and 6% African-American. (The percentages exceed 100%

17

because participants were allowed to select multiple options where appropriate.) Since the researchers were interested in the possible effects of religiosity, religious affiliations were requested and were as follows: 30% Protestant, 29% Catholic, 5% Jewish, 2% Hindu, 2% Buddhist, 2% Taoist, 2% Islamic, and 20% atheist/agnostic or no religion.

Since there was no reliable and valid humility measure available at the time of this study, they utilized some open-ended questions about humility, in addition to the Likert-type ratings described below. An eleven-point scale asked participants to rate their immediate association with the word humility (-5 = negative, +5 = positive). They also rated their responses to these items: "To what extent do you think that it would be good if you were less humble?" and "To what extent do you think that it would be good if you were more humble?" Participants were asked to define humility in an open-ended format. Coding categories were generated by one of the researchers, with both researchers coding responses. Agreement between the two coders was good, with kappas from 0.89 to 1.0. Respondents were also asked to recall a past life situation in which they felt humble, and the emotions they experienced at the time. These responses were coded as in the previous question, and kappas ranged from 0.89 – 0.92. The last open-ended question asked, "Please think of an example of a person who you see as being very humble." Participants were then asked to briefly describe the person and why he/she was seen as humble. Responses were coded by the same procedure and kappas ranged from 0.85 to 1.0. Next, the researchers provided 35 pairs of dichotomous adjectives (filler items and theoretically-related items) to be used to complete the following sentence: "A person who is humble is likely to be…". Since the researchers were interested in whether it was more advantageous for some types of people to be humble, participants were given a list of

people in different social roles, and asked if humility would be seen as a strength or weakness in their particular role. The last measures were Likert-type scales which assessed self-esteem, religiosity, narcissism, and social desirability.

The results consistently demonstrated that participants' overall views of humility were positive. Their immediate associations with the word humility were favorable (M=2.4, SD=2.7), and they were more likely to want to become more humble (M=6.1) then less (M=2.3). The results also showed that the students did not think humility was similar to low self-esteem, shame or humiliation, but was similar to modesty.

In the open-ended definitions, 44% of the participants used the word "modesty" or made reference to modest behaviors. Other commonalities associated with the humility definitions were unselfishness (17%), and lack of arrogance (19%). There were some who associated humility with the negative qualities of shame, humiliation or embarrassment (10%) or a submissive or passive attitude (5%). In describing a real-life situation in which they felt humble, participants reported higher levels of pleasant affect (M=6.6, SD=3.0) than unpleasant affect (M=2.6, SD=2.8) associated with the memory. A majority (61%) reported an experience involving success or accomplishment, while only 24% recalled a situation that involved lowering of the self.

Participants most often chose peers (41%), relatives (22%), popular religious figures (13%), celebrities (10%), and personal religious leaders (3%) when asked to name a humble person. In their description of these persons, they identified such positive attributes as caring toward others (56%), refraining from bragging (55%), being successful (47%), and having an unselfish or self-sacrificing attitude (21%). When deciding whether humility was a strength or weakness in various social roles, participants

19

generally reported humility as a strength, but humility was rated more favorably in religious seekers than in close others or subordinates. Overall, humility was most highly favored in social roles that emphasized virtue or positive social relationships.

There were some individual differences, as those with higher religiosity scores had more positive conceptions of humility, while sex was not associated with views of humility. Narcissism correlated negatively with the belief that humility is a part of good adjustment and confidence. Self-esteem did not show consistent associations with views of humility. While social desirability showed some associations with perceptions of humility, all significant results remained when social desirability was controlled.

Considering all the negative associations of humility in modern culture, this study's findings reveal a strong positive evaluation of humility's virtue. Humble individuals were seen as well-adjusted, kind, and high in ability. In concluding their study, the researchers bemoaned the dearth of research on humility, and encouraged additional study on this important topic, and the development of a valid and reliable measure.

Attempts to measure humility implicitly

Although little empirical research exists on the character strength of humility (Tangney, 2000), much research has been done on accuracy and bias in self-evaluation (Gaertner, Sedikides, & Graetz, 1999; Sedikides & Strube, 1997; Taylor & Brown, 1988). One repeated finding in this body of research is that individuals rate themselves better than others. This characteristic is referred to as the self-enhancing bias. In two studies, Rowatt et al. (2002) use the magnitude of this self-other bias as an estimate of humility. People who substantially overvalue themselves in relation to others or considerably

undervalue others in relation to themselves would be demonstrating less humility, while those who more similarly evaluate themselves and others would be manifesting greater humility. These researchers were also interested in the relationship between religiosity and humility.

Participants in Study 1 were 249 undergraduate students at a large private university in the southwestern United States. The vast majority of these students were Protestant (74%), with 23% Catholic and 3% other, with 70.7% attending church at least once a month. Participants completed Allport and Ross's (1967) Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scales, along with Batson and Schoenrade's (1991) Quest scale, and Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis's (1993) doctrinal orthodoxy scale. They also completed the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, which is a widely used social desirability scale (Paulhus, 1988). Last, the researchers assessed participant's level of humility by asking them to rate the degree to which the self and others follow 12 biblical commandments.

The researchers found that, on average, the college students perceived themselves ($M = 6.22$, $SD = 1.24$) to have adhered more closely to biblical commandments than others ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 1.25$). Only 2 % of the sample believed that other people followed biblical commandments more than they did. A multiple regression analysis showed higher intrinsic religiousness, quest, and impression management scores accounted for significant variance in the difference between self and other's adherence to the biblical commandments, with college students again believing that they were more likely than their fellow students to follow biblical commandments. Extrinsic religiousness did not appear to be associated with the self-other difference. This relationship between

high intrinsic religiosity, and "less humility" (as measured in this study) was unexpected, so a 2 (self, other) x 3 (low, medium, and high intrinsic religiosity) repeated measures ANCOVA was calculated using self-adherence to biblical commands and other-adherence to the commands as the dependent variables, and impression management as the covariate. College students reported they followed biblical commandments more than they reported others did, even when controlling for impression management. Students with the highest intrinsic religiousness scores also rated their self-adherence greater than those with medium and low intrinsic religiousness scores, and the other's adherence lower than those with medium and low religiousness scores.

Study 2 sought to replicate the results of Study 1 and to examine the scope of the influence of religiosity on the self-other bias. Participants were 191 undergraduate students from the same university as the previous study. The religious affiliations were similar to that of Study 1, with most participants Protestant (82%). The students completed the same measures as Study 1, but in addition completed Altemeyer and Hunsberger's (1992) religious fundamentalism scale and DeNeve's (2000) general religiousness scale. Each participant rated the extent to which the self, fellow college students, and the average person followed the 12 biblical commandments used in the previous study. They were also asked to rate the three persons on 8 positive traits and 8 negative traits.

The results of the previous study were replicated in Study 2. Controlling for impression management, those who were highest in intrinsic religiousness rated themselves as adhering more closely to the biblical commandments than others. They also rated others as adhering less closely to the commandments than the medium and low

intrinsic religious groups. This pattern of high self ratings and low other ratings is further evidence of low humility among the intrinsically religious. Another possible interpretation is that people who are more intrinsically religious remember their own experiences easier than similar experiences of others. Two additional interpretations that the researchers failed to consider were the influence of the self-enhancing bias, and the possibility that those high in intrinsic religiousness might truly be stronger adherents to the biblical commandments in question than the others they recalled.

Researchers accept that if humility is truly going to be understood, then a quantitative measure must be developed (Emmons & Paloutzian, 2004; Exline et al., 2004; Myers, 1998; Worthington, 2008). Rowatt et al. (2006) asserted that, by definition, humility is difficult to assess through a self-reporting, explicit measure, so they endeavored to develop a more implicit method. They defined humility as a "psychological quality characterized by being more humble, modest, down-to-earth, open-minded, and respectful of others." (p.199). If humility involves self-forgetfulness or being less self-attentive, then Rowatt et al. reasoned that the truly humble might not be able to report their humble qualities.

In two studies, Rowatt et al. (2006) tested the Humility-Arrogance Implicit Association Test they patterned after existing validated measures of implicit self-esteem (Greenwald & Farnham, 2000) and implicit shyness (Asendorpf, Banse, & Mucke, 2002). The Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998) served as the theoretical basis behind using an implicit measure to assess humility. The IAT assumes that attributes of the self are more easily and quickly processed than less related concepts and qualities. So, the faster a person correctly sorts words into categories (e.g.

self & kind; others & rude), the stronger the implicit association between the person and concept.

In Study 1, the researchers set out to test the reliability and validity of the Humility IAT, to discover any correlations between humility and personal qualities, and psychological benefits. For the purpose of establishing convergent validity, they included existing measures of agreeableness, modesty, and narcissism. They also included a subscale of the Values in Action Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IS), a 10-item unpublished measure of modest self-presentation and low self-focus, traits thought to be similar to humility (Peterson, & Seligman, 2004). Measures of extraversion, conscientiousness, and impression management were also included to assess discriminant validity. In order to test reliability, both internal consistency and 2-week test-retest reliability were examined. Participants in Study 1 were 135 undergraduate students (M=20 years old). In addition to the measures included for validation purposes, several tests (e.g. Satisfaction with Life Scale, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, Life Orientation Test) of psychological health and well-being were also included. The humility-arrogance of 53 participants who completed the Humility IAT a second time was also rated by one to three informants (e.g. close friend, romantic partner and/or a family member) for the purpose of comparing participants' implicit humility scores with the informants' evaluation of their humility.

Participants more quickly categorized the terms of the Humility IAT in the congruent condition (self + humility, other + arrogant) than in the incongruent condition (self + arrogant, other + humility). The implicit humility scores were similar for men (M=0.41, SD=0.38) and women (M=0.43, SD=0.34), as well as being similar for self-reported humility relative to arrogance. The Humility IAT's internal and temporal

24

consistency was strong both times (Time1 $\propto=0.87$; Time 2 $\propto=0.89$). A moderately

positive correlation was found between implicit humility measured at Times 1 and 2 (2-

week interval) r=0.45, p<0.001, n=54. The proposed Humility IAT relative to arrogance

correlated positively with implicit self esteem (r=0.32) and negatively with overall

narcissism (r=-0.19), and particularly with tendencies like exhibitionism (r=-0.18). This

would indicate good convergent and divergent validity.

They also found that increases in implicit humility were associated with viewing

oneself as a person of worth and not with negative self-attributes. There was no

correlation between implicit humility and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with life. One

finding that left the researchers puzzled was that implicit humility did not correlate

strongly with ratings of humility made by a friend, partner or family member.

In Study 2, Rowatt et al. sought to further validate the Humility IAT by

investigating whether humility is associated with academic performance in a college

introductory psychology course. Sixty-seven undergraduate students participated, with

data from 55 meeting all the requirements to be used for comparison purposes.

As was found in Study 1, the Humility IAT relationships with narcissism

(negative) and self-esteem (positive) were replicated as well as evidence for internal

consistency ($\propto =0.90$). In addition, it was discovered that implicitly humble students

earned higher course grades in an introductory psychology course than students who were

less implicitly humble. The researchers were careful to assert that these findings do not

indicate that humility causes greater academic performance, but this positive correlation

is another example of a positive connotation of humility. Even with this seeming success,

the researchers suggested that they had barely scratched the surface of what could be

known about the assessment, development, and functions of humility. They urged further quantitative studies that continue to examine explicit humility, and how it might develop across the life span and world cultures.

Research of a related construct: Modesty

One of the greatest difficulties in studying character strengths is adequately defining the particular concept from a theoretical point of view, yet continuing to reflect the everyday understanding from which it comes. Gregg, Hart, Sedikides, and Kumashiro (2008) responded to this challenge in their study on modesty. They concede that modesty is often allied with humility, but they argue that modesty is different enough to merit further study.

They make a viable argument that a good scientific definition of a construct must have both rigor and coverage. By rigor they mean the definition "should be clear and coherent, fit neatly into a broader theoretical framework, and lend itself easily to measurement and manipulation" (p.978). When properly defined, the condition necessary or sufficient to qualify a behavior as modest should be readily identifiable. To properly meet definition coverage, one must "comprehensively capture a phenomenon of interest faithfully, map onto its manifold facets and reveal rather than conceal its richness" (p. 979). In order to meet these two competing demands, a balance must be struck between theoretical exactness and the looseness of everyday usage.

Gregg et al. (2008) conducted three studies to characterize the everyday concept of modesty. In study 1, they used two samples of volunteers, the first being 79 UK employees (34.0 years old) and the second comprising 118 US undergraduates. Participants wrote down all the characteristics that they believed would distinguish a

modest person. They were told to give a single word or short phrases and had four minutes to complete the task.

Two independent judges then divided and categorized participant responses based on the repetition of lexically similar exemplars, semantic relatedness of different exemplars, and the judges' prior knowledge about the grouping of personality traits. The UK participants generated 469 exemplars grouped into 100 original categories. Of these 100 categories, 48 were considered applicable to U.S. exemplars. An additional 54 were added to subsume the 684 US exemplars. Since the goal of the researchers was prototypicality, they eliminated categories that were not adequately shared by both samples (UK and US) leaving 48 common categories. Exemplar frequency per category served as their primary index of prototypicality, with the order of the listing serving as a secondary index.

Humble and nonboastful surfaced as main categories in describing the everyday understanding of modesty. This is in line with the relationship formally mentioned between humility and modesty. Another central category, solicitousness, is not often associated with the theoretical understanding of modesty, but has been associated with it at a more practical level (Exline & Geyer, 2004). Gregg et al. (2008) also found that the vast majority of the exemplars and categories regarded modesty as a positive characteristic.

In the second study, 54 UK undergraduates were asked to sort hypothetical persons demonstrating various exemplars of modest (or not) behavior into the 4 categories of remote, marginal, peripheral, and central. Follow-up pairwise comparisons confirmed that each successive rating differed significantly from its predecessor meaning

they found a significant increase in mean modesty ratings as they went from remote, to marginal, to peripheral, to central categorization.

Study three had 175 participants who were recruited and participated via the internet, and were primarily from the US (54%), UK (30%), and Canada (9%). Its purpose was to replicate the previous study's effects with a more diverse population, and also to show that the prototypical exemplars would be selected as being more modest more quickly, representing an automatic or implicit cognitive understanding. Once again a significant linear effect was found, with a stepwise rise in the frequency with which the more prototypical exemplar was chosen, but in addition, a significant linear effect was found in the rise in the speed with which the exemplar was chosen.

This study confirms that modesty, as defined by everyday exemplars, is viewed more positively than negatively. It was also confirmed that modesty has both intrapsychic and interpersonal aspects. Finally, people regarded modest behavior as being more prosocial and proactive than previously thought (Cialdini et al., 1998; Tice et al., 1995). There was no discussion of individual differences in how respondents selected the exemplars, nor were there any attempts by the researchers at validating the prototypicality of the exemplars. Overall, the findings indicate that modest people are seen to be interpersonally pleasant, yet remain socially unobtrusive. They are also not inclined to boasting, and are able to show genuine care for people around them. As stated previously, there is considerable overlap between the concepts of modesty and humility, but the positive outcomes for modesty found in this research, would seem to be equally possible for humility.

Research of a related construct: Self-Compassion

Exline (2008) suggests that humility reduces the amount of energy that people need to spend on self-enhancement, and makes it easier for people to admit they need help. Similarly, humble people should be more likely to be self-compassionate because of this. Neff (2003) defines self-compassion as follows:

- Extending kindness and understanding to oneself rather than harsh self-criticism and judgment;
- Seeing one's experiences as part of the larger human experience rather than as separating and isolating; and
- Holding one's painful thoughts and feelings in balanced awareness rather than over-identifying with them.

Self-compassion's connection with the common human experience seems similar to humility's focus on the equality of humankind.

Self-compassion is a Buddhist concept, not widely known in western psychological circles. At first glance it may seem antithetical to humility, but the process of self-compassion requires metacognitive activity that tends to break the cycle of self-absorption and over-identification. This decreases feelings of egocentric isolation and increases a sense of interconnectedness. It also encourages positive emotions toward oneself without feeling the need to bolster or protect one's self-concept. Unlike the evaluation process involved in self-esteem, self-compassion focuses on feelings of kindness and understanding toward oneself and the recognition of one's common humanity. The purpose of the present study was to create a valid and reliable self-compassion scale, and to empirically examine the psychological outcomes associated with various levels of self-compassion.

Neff (2003) began construction of the Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) by involving 68 participants (30 males and 38 females) in small focus groups. These undergraduate students answered a series of open-ended questions about self-compassion. The purpose of these groups was to hear people's reactions to experiences of pain or failure so that potential scale items could be generated that would be relevant and understood by future users. Next, participants completed a brief questionnaire containing a number of potential scale items previously generated by the researchers. They then gave feedback about the items' comprehensibility and relevance. After every small group, the potential scale items were modified and expanded. A second phase of the pilot testing administered the scale to a group of 71 undergraduates (24 males, 47 females). They were asked to check any items that seemed unclear or confusing, and items checked more than once were deleted from the item pool.

The next phase, Study 1, involved administering the pool of potential SCS items to 391 undergraduates (166 males, 225 females). Ten of the original 18 items designed to assess self-kindness versus self-judgment were retained, with 5 self-kindness items modeled to load on one factor and 5 self-judgment items modeled to load on a second correlated factor. The internal consistency reliabilities were good (.78 and .77 respectively). A similar pattern was found for the items used to assess common humanity versus isolation. A two-factor model which included 4 items from both categories fit the data best with good internal reliabilities (.80 and .79 respectively). The final dyad of mindfulness versus over-identification also fit best in a two-factor model with 4 items from each being retained. Internal consistency reliabilities were again good with the mindfulness items at .75 and the over-identification items at .81. Besides the good

reliabilities of the 6 subscale scores, the overall SCS score did adequately fit a single higher-order factor of self-compassion with good internal consistency for the 26 item SCS (.92).

In terms of content validity, individuals with the highest SCS scores reported they tended to be equally kind to self and others, while those with lower SCS scores reporting they were kinder to others than themselves. Self-compassion scores showed a negative correlation with self-criticism and a positive correlation with a sense of social connectedness. That self-compassion may aid psychological resiliency and well-being was shown with its negative correlation with anxiety and depression and positive relationship with life satisfaction. This study also found that women reported having less self-compassion than men. When differences on the subscale were examined, women were more likely to engage in self-judgment, to feel isolated when faced with difficult situations, and to be more over-identified with their own negative emotions. This finding is consistent with past findings that females tend to be more self-critical.

Study 2 (Neff, 2003) set out to examine how self-compassion differs from self-esteem. Participants were 232 undergraduates who completed the SCS, two measures of self-esteem, a measure of narcissism, and the emotional regulation and psychological well-being scales used in Study 1. Results indicated a moderate correlation between self-compassion and self-esteem, with more self-compassionate participants likely to have high self-esteem, than those who lacked self-compassion. Where self-compassion differed from self-esteem was its lack of relationships with narcissism, with both measures of self-esteem being correlated with narcissism. Again, SCS scores were related to healthy psychological well-being outcomes.

31

Overall, Neff's findings support the positive benefits of high self-compassion without the possible effects associated with high self-esteem. Self-compassion should be linked to greater knowledge and clarity about one's own limitations because there is no need to deny personal shortcomings in order to maintain a positive self-image. This quality of self-compassion seems similar to humility's attribute of an accurate self-understanding and self-awareness (Tangney, 2000).

Humility as a personality trait

Some have recently proposed that humility may represent a sixth factor of personality. Ashton, Lee, Perugini, Szarota, de Vries, Di Blas, Boies, and De Raad (2004) reviewed the proposed six-factor solutions obtained in eight independent psycholexical studies of personality structure from seven different languages. Previous research has settled on a five-factor solution (Goldberg, 1990), but the present researchers propose that a six-factor solution, which includes the additional category of honesty – humility provides a better fit of the data.

The review of Ashton et al. was based on the following data sets: Dutch data are 400 self-ratings on 551 adjectives; French data are 418 self ratings on 388 adjectives; German data are 408 self-ratings on 430 adjectives; Hungarian data are 400 self-ratings on 561 adjectives; Italian (Rome) data are 577 self-ratings on 285 adjectives; Italian (Trieste) data are 369 self-ratings on 369 adjectives; Korean data are 435 self-ratings on 406 adjectives; and Polish data are 350 self-ratings on 290 adjectives. The researchers used a quantitative method (Peabody & DeRaad, 2002) that involved sorting adjectives into subjectively defined categories, each of which contained roughly synonymous terms.

For each of the six factors, the 12 highest-loading terms on each pole of the factor had to have an absolute loading of at least .35 on the factor to be selected.

Factor one was generally characterized by attributes of extraversion, such as talkativeness, sociability, cheerfulness, and energetic versus quietness, shyness, passivity, and withdrawal. The second factor has been commonly referred to as agreeableness and is characterized by gentleness, tolerance, patience, peacefulness, agreeableness, and good-naturedness versus irritability, argumentativeness, aggression, and quick tempered. Factor three generally has been termed conscientiousness, and is mainly defined by orderliness, precision, diligence, carefulness, and discipline versus disorganization, laziness, negligence, recklessness, and irresponsibility. The fourth factor might be best called emotionality and covers the concepts of anxiety, fearfulness, vulnerability, fragility, emotionality, sensitivity, and sentimentality versus fearlessness, strength, courage, toughness, independence, and self-assurance. The fifth factor is the newest categorization of traits and has been labeled honesty-humility. This factor is best defined by the terms honesty, sincerity, fairness, loyalty, and modesty versus deceit, hypocrisy, conceit, shyness, pretentiousness, and greed. The last factor is referred to as intellect/imagination and is represented by the adjectives creative, intellectual, philosophical, talented, witty, and unconventional versus their opposites.

Based on their findings, Ashton et al. strongly encourage the addition of the honesty-humility factor to the traditional Big Five personality model. They also suggest a revision of the present agreeableness and emotionality factors with important shifts of content. Presently, low irritability is a part of emotional stability, but in this study would better fit within the agreeableness factor. On the other hand, the elements of sensitivity

and sentimentality are now most often aligned with agreeableness, when the present researchers suggest it fits better with emotionality. This study makes a strong case for at least some aspects of humility being a personality trait, again supporting the need for an assessment of dispositional humility.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN

The purposes of this study were to develop an instrument that might successfully measure dispositional humility and begin testing its reliability and validity. A reliable and valid measure of humility would further research in the aspects and understanding of forgiveness, and provide insights into humility's potential effects on interpersonal relationships as well as its effects on individuals' physical and mental health and well-being.

For the purposes of this research, humility was defined by the characteristics highlighted previously:

- Having an accurate self-assessment;

- Able to keep one's talents and accomplishments in perspective;

- Free from egocentric arrogance and low self-esteem;

- An understanding of the equality of mankind at its core

- A self-transcendence, while recognizing one's place in the universe (Tangney, 2000).

On the basis of this definition an initial set of twenty questions was generated. To avoid some of the biases of self-reporting, the questions primarily asked participants to assess behavioral outcomes. Some of the questions originating from the above definition are:

- When asked I can give an accurate assessment of my personal strengths.

- I enjoy spending time reflecting on the majesty and power of nature.

- I often spend time thinking about my personal inadequacies.

- I have often pondered my "smallness" in the face of the universe.

In a previous study (Exline & Geyer, 2004), researchers had asked participants' perceptions and views of humility, and why they considered it an admirable quality. It was discovered that participants considered humility a positive and desirable quality for most circumstances, and that when asked to recall a humbling experience the majority (61%) wrote of a time of accomplishment or success. In an attempt to generate additional questions for the original humility measure, a similar process was utilized.

Development and initial testing of measure

For the initial development of the humility scale, 46 undergraduate students from an upper-level psychology class (22 females and 24 males) at a private, liberal arts college in the Southeastern United States were asked to participate as part of an in-class assignment. Students were asked to respond to the open-ended questions, "Describe a recent time or circumstance in your life when you experienced feelings of humility," and "What is your definition of humility?" This assignment was given at the first of class prior to any discussion of humility or any other positive virtue.

The purpose of this part of the procedure was to derive additional questions for the initial humility measure. Since the study used undergraduate students in analyzing the humility instrument, it seemed reasonable to gain information for possible questions from the same cohort. Based on the findings of a previous study (Exline & Geyer, 2004), we

assumed that participants will have an adequate grasp of humility as a positive virtue, rather than a harmful view of it as humiliation or shame. The students' definitions of humility were used to discover their perception of humility, while their personal descriptions of a humbling circumstance or situation provided pertinent input to form questions to assess the various facets of humility. The questions derived from the participants' personal definitions and experiences of humility were behaviorally-based and provided opportunities to operationalize the humility concept. The goal was to have at least 50 to 60 questions, so that questions that fail to adequately assess humility could be eliminated.

After initially generating 20 theory-based (using Tangney's definition for humility) questions to assess humility, it was determined that there needed to be additional questions for this initial scale development stage. Since previous studies have shown that humility is difficult to measure overtly, 46 students from an upper – level psychology class (22 females and 24 males) at a private, liberal arts college in the Southeastern United States were asked to participate as part of an in-class assignment. All students responded to the open-ended questions, "describe a recent time or circumstance in your life when you experienced feelings of humility," and "what is your definition of humility." This assignment was given at the first of class prior to any discussion of humility or any other positive virtue. Average age of the participants was 21.4, with 89% being Caucasian. After the assignment was completed, the class participated in a debriefing process and group discussion of the virtue of humility in human relationships. The purpose of this part of the experiment was to derive several more questions for the initial humility measure. To that end, the study was successful as 40 additional questions

were derived from their personal experiences of humility. The outcomes were similar to the previous study by Exline and Geyer (2004) with 72% of the respondents in this study describing humility in a positive manner. The other 28% identified an experience where they felt ashamed or humiliated. An example of one of the participants who wrote about being humiliated follows: "…the last time I felt humbled I wanted to fly to Africa and stay there. It was a horrible experience and everywhere I went, I felt that people were staring at me and thinking what a loser I was." But even though this describes a negative experience, the person went on to write "I didn't feel that way long though. I got over it quickly knowing that eventually I would be embarrassed again and forget that time." It would seem that this person was able to put her humbling experience into perspective without suffering any undue consequences. Another respondent wrote, "I felt very small and unimportant, a little embarrassed, insignificant, not as good at something as someone else." From these negative experiences of humility, the following questions were generated.

> ➢ I often wish I was as talented as my peers.
> ➢ I don't have my act together the way I'd like.
> ➢ Recently, I have felt ashamed at my arrogance.
> ➢ I get angry with know-it-alls.

Even those who recalled more negative or humiliating experiences stated they were able to learn from it and responded to it as a personal challenge to overcome, rather than an event which left them harmed or scarred. This is probably a result of the character of these participants, since they were upper-level college students, and by that very fact

they had exhibited a certain level of individual hardiness. When asked to define humility, these participants wrote:

- "to think of yourself less and think of others more,"
- "a state of submissiveness and openness that comes from realizing that even though there are things greater than you, you are still very valuable,"
- "not thinking higher of yourself than you ought, but not thinking badly of yourself either."

In a replication of the findings of Exline and Geyer (2004) these definitions more closely resemble the guiding concepts for this study than they do the more negative, traditional definition of humility.

In contrast to the preceding, most of the participants (72%) in Study 1 recalled a humbling experience that was more directly tied to success or a personal accomplishment. Here are examples of these more positive examples of humbling experiences:

- "I felt humbled yesterday when my sister wanted to spend time with me,"
- "the last time I felt humbled I felt like I was lucky to be where I am today,"
- "I had thought of myself as too good to do something, but then a person of higher position ended up doing what I could have done,"
- "I felt humbled when I was driving home through the mountains and I was just admiring nature, it reminded me that God had created all of this."

From these positive experiences of humility, an additional number of questions were derived. Following are some examples:

➢ I am deeply touched when others sacrifice for me.

➢ It is hard for me to accept others' praise because I am far from perfect.

➢ When asked to do something, I usually think of others who are more qualified.

➢ The challenges ahead of me often cause me to feel overwhelmed.

These participants defined humility as "not taking the credit, because I know I couldn't have done it by myself," "not thinking highly of yourself, willing to lower yourself to uplift others," "not exalting self, it is also not self-hatred," and "it is being willing to serve others." Again these definitions highlight an accurate understanding of the virtuous characteristics of humility and provide some insight as to how they believe humility may prove helpful in their own interpersonal relationships.

The 40 questions that came from the participants' descriptions and definitions of humility were based on the main principle or idea found in the 46 scenarios and definitions provided. Some of the more rich 'stories' provided 2 or 3 questions while several were not conducive to a possible self-report question. The value of this approach in instrument development is that it used input from a sample pool of persons who will also be used in later studies for further development of the scale.

Study 1

Participants

Once the initial 60 question humility measure was developed, it was given to a convenience sample of 120 undergraduate students from a private, liberal arts college and a large public university, both located in the southeastern United States. The participants signed up for times to participate for minimal extra-credit in lower-level psychology classes. After completing a consent form, they completed the survey packet in groups of 8-10, and were given an instruction page that let them know they were answering questions about their self-understanding, their religiosity/spirituality, and their faith or non-faith commitments. They were asked to respond about their typical behaviors or tendencies, but there was no mention of humility or related concepts.

Procedures

Once the data were gathered, corrected item-total correlations were utilized to pare down the Humility scale by removing items with poor item-total correlations. The goal was to create a reliable, single-factor measure of humility with fewer than 40 questions. Any correlations between the Humility scale and the other instruments were also analyzed for the possibility of establishing criterion, convergent, and discriminant validity.

The next step was the actual assessment of the 60-item humility measure. The humility scale was based on 5-point Likert-type items (from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). Demographic questions concerning gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, and educational level were also included. Based on a review of the literature, in

addition to the humility instrument, the following measures were used to test the

reliability and validity of the humility test.

Measures

Since humility means freedom from "egocentric arrogance" it would make sense

that a humble person would probably not demonstrate narcissistic tendencies, so the

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) (Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988) was

used to check for divergent validity. The NPI is a 40-item scale based on the DSM-III

criteria for Narcissistic Personality Disorder which is designed to measure narcissism as a

normal personality trait. The NPI forces respondents to choose one of two items within a

pair, one of which is narcissistic. For example, one pair reads: "I always know what I am

doing" and "Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing." The final narcissism score is

determined by totaling the number of narcissistic items endorsed. Exploratory factor

analysis demonstrated that the NPI has seven factors including Authority, Self-

Sufficiency, Superiority, Exhibitionism, Exploitativeness, Vanity, and Entitlement, with

Guttman lambda three (alpha) estimates of 0.73, 0.63, 0.54, 0.50, 0.52, 0.50, and 0.64

respectively.

Humility has often been related to aspects of spirituality, and is perceived as a

virtue to be practiced by the participants of most world religions, so several measures

tapping various qualities of religiosity and spirituality were used. The Spiritual Well

Being scale (SPWB; Ellison, 1983) is conceptualized as having vertical and horizontal

components, with the vertical assessing Religious Well-Being (RWB) and the horizontal

Existential Well-Being (EWB). The Religious Well-Being subscale measures satisfaction

with and meaning from one's relationship with God. The Existential Well-Being subscale

42

reveals one's sense of life purpose and life satisfaction (Hammermeister & Peterson, 2001). Good internal consistency has been demonstrated by coefficient alphas of 0.89 (SPWB), 0.87 (RWB), and 0.78 (EWB), as well as test-retest coefficients of 0.93, 0.96, and 0.86 respectively (Ellison & Smith, 1991). Examples of statements are "I feel most fulfilled when I'm in close communion with God" (RWB) and "I believe there is some real purpose for my life" (EWB). The scale has 20 total items, 10 reflecting each subscale (RWB and EWB), and the overall score being a composite of the 2 subscales. It was used to determine any relationships between humility and these aspects of well-being.

The Faith Maturity Scale (FMS; Benson, Donahue, & Erickson, 1993) was also used. It assesses perception of closeness to God, and the degree to which that perception translates to commitment to help others. Sample items are "My faith shapes how I think and act each and every day", and "In my free time, I help people who have problems or needs." Scale reliability is good (Cronbach's alpha) at 0.88, and the validity has been established through comparison to similar measures of religiosity and by analysis of experts in several mainline denominations.

A similar instrument, the Religious Maturity Scale (RMS; Dudley, & Cruise, 1990) attempts to measure religious maturity from a psychological perspective, rather than from a theological perspective. The scale roughly borrows from Allport's model of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, while taking into account the importance of religion as a quest. Examples of questions are "I am happy with my present religion but wish to be open to new insights and ways of understanding the meaning of life" and "While we can never be quite sure that what we believe is absolutely true, it is worth acting on the probability that it may be." The scale has moderate reliability (Cronbach alpha = 0.55).

43

The final religiosity scale used is the Religious Commitment Inventory (R10; Worthington et al., 2003). Unlike the previous measures of religiosity and spirituality, the R10 attempts to specifically target religious commitment of participants by assessing their involvement in typical religious activities, rather than adherence to specific religious principles. Samples of items are "I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith," and "I enjoy working in the activities of my religious organization." The coefficient alpha was 0.93, and the test-retest reliability coefficient was 0.87. Construct, discriminant and criterion-related validity were also well-established in the initial, as well as in follow-up research (Witvliet, Hinze, & Worthington, 2008).

Some have suggested that humility and empathy are requisite precursors for relational forgiveness (Sandage, 1997; Worthington, 1998). Due to this possible relationship, the Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy (EMP; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972) was used. Examples of items are "I would feel sorry for a lonely stranger in a group" and "I get upset when I see someone cry". The total empathy score has reported good split-half reliability of 0.84 in a sample of undergraduates.

The last measure included was the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWB; Pavot & Diener, 1993). It has shown strong internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha of 0.87; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) and moderate temporal stability over a four year test-retest (0.54; Pavot & Diener, 1993). A sample item is "In most ways my life is close to ideal". This measure was chosen because of its good psychometrics and to see whether the humility measure had a relationship with the cognitive aspects of happiness.

Study 2

Participants

After the Humility scale had been pared down to 32 questions, and there remained good internal reliability, then an additional study was used to further test the revised scale's validity and reliability. Again it was given to a convenience sample of 86 undergraduate students from a large public university, located in the southeastern United States. The participants signed up for times to participate for minimal extra-credit in a lower-level psychology class. After completing a consent form, they independently completed the survey packet in groups of 8-10, and were given an instruction page that let them know they were answering questions about their self-understanding, their religiosity/spirituality, and their faith or non-faith commitments. They responded concerning their typical behaviors or tendencies, but there was no mention of humility or related concepts. They were not allowed to participate in this study if they previously participated in Study 1.

Procedures

The revised version of the Humility scale was the first measure in the questionnaire packet. Similar demographic questions were asked and the scales previously used for validating the humility scale, and in Study 1 which provided valuable information, were again included (i.e., Narcissistic Personality Inventory, Religious Commitment Inventory-10, Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy, and the Satisfaction with Life Scale).

Measures

In addition to the above, the Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES; Campbell et al., 2004) was added to assess for discriminant validity. The PES is a 9-item self-report measure of the extent to which individuals believe they deserve special attention or treatment. It has strong internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.87) and its validity was established in studies assessing willingness to take candy designated for children and reported entitlement to pay in a hypothetical employment setting. Those scoring high on the PES demonstrated selfish approaches to romantic relationships, and responded aggressively following ego threat. Examples of items are "I honestly feel I'm just more deserving than others," and "I feel entitled to more of everything." It was expected that the humility scale would be negatively related to the PES.

Due to humility's seemingly unique relationship to self esteem, the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (SES; Rosenberg, 1965) was also used. The version used in this study had 10 items rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale with items summed across all items. The widely used SES has consistently strong reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.92) and its validity has been demonstrated by its continued use over the past four decades. Sample items are "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself," and "I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal place with others." It was uncertain whether humility would be related to global self-esteem, as humble persons strive for an accurate self-understanding, and often self-esteem is more related to overly positive or negative self-evaluations.

Since humility is theorized to be an important component of the process of forgiveness, then it would seem reasonable that those who are humble would be more likely to have good relations with others, and possibly have good social support. For that

reason, the UCLA Loneliness Scale-Revised (LON; Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980) was included. The scale has high internal consistency (coefficient alpha of (0.92) and has often been used to measure the presence or lack of individuals' quality relationships. It has 20 items scored on a Likert-type 4 point scale (ranging from 1 = "I am never this way" to 4 = "I am often this way"), with half of the items being reverse scored. Concurrent validity has been indicated in that lonely people, as shown by their loneliness scale scores, report more limited social activities and relationships. Sample items are "I lack companionship" and "I have a lot in common with the people around me."

Again due to humility's proposed relationship with forgiveness, the Forgiving Personality Inventory (FP; Drinnon, Jones, & Lawler, 2000) was included as well. This measure has 33 items to which a participant responds a 5-point Likert-type scale from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree. The scale has shown strong internal consistency with a coefficient alpha of 0.93 and test-retest correlation of 0.86 over a two month period. Examples of items are "I believe in the importance of forgiveness," and "If someone wrongs me, I tend to hold a grudge."

The last scale to be added for study two was an abbreviated form of the Scales of Psychological Well-being (PWB; Ryff, 1989). The PWB scales measure total psychological well-being and the six dimensions of autonomy (AU), environmental mastery (EM), personal growth (PG), positive relations with others (PR), purpose in life (PL), and self-acceptance (SA). It is theorized that trait humility would possibly be related to greater psychological well-being, especially as shown in the dimensions of positive relations with others, environmental mastery, and personal growth. The abbreviated form consists of 30 items, about equally divided between positive and

47

negative phrases, with respondents asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed "Strongly", "Moderately", or "Slightly" that an item described how they typically thought or felt. Each scale exhibits convergent and discriminant validity and reduced item versions of each scale confirm the theoretical structure of psychological well-being and replicate age and gender differences in nationally representative samples (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Strong internal reliability for the overall score has also been indicated with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90, and remained within acceptable ranges for the reduced-item scales (Lawler-Row & Elliott, 2009; Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

After the data were collected, reliability analyses were run confirming the humility scale's internal consistency. Any correlations between the Humility scale and the other instruments were also analyzed for the possibility of establishing criterion, convergent, and discriminant validity.

Study 3

Participants

This third study consisted of a questionnaire packet given to a convenience sample of 80 undergraduate students from a private, liberal arts university, located in the southeastern United States. The participants signed up for times to participate for minimal extra-credit in lower-level undergraduate classes. After completing a consent form, they independently completed the survey packet, and were given an instruction page that let them know they were answering questions about their self-understanding, their religiosity/spirituality, and their psychological well-being. They were asked to respond about their typical behaviors or tendencies, but the instructions had no mention

48

of humility or related concepts. They were not allowed to participate in this study if they previously participated in Studies one or two.

Procedures

Recently, there has been research done on the concept of self-compassion. Self-compassion seemingly shares some characteristics with aspects of humility. Self-compassion values one's connection with others in common humanity, while humble persons would value the equality of mankind at it its core. Neff (2003) has defined self-compassion as: (a) extending kindness and understanding to the self in instances of pain or failure rather than harsh judgment and self-criticism, (b) seeing one's experiences as part of the larger human experience rather than seeing them as separating and isolating, and (c) holding one's painful thoughts and feelings in mindful awareness rather than over-identifying with them. Self-compassion is a relatively new concept to Western psychology, but with recent interest in Eastern philosophical ideas, and Buddhist psychology in particular, it has been suggested as providing helpful information on psychological functioning. Since some of the aspects of self-compassion resemble characteristics of humility, this study will examine whether any relationship exists between the Humility scale and Neff's self-compassion scale (2003).

Measures

The revised version of the Humility scale was the first measure in the questionnaire packet, followed by Neff's Self-Compassion Scale (2003). The Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) consists of 26 items which assess six different aspects of self-compassion: Self-Kindness (e.g., ''I try to be understanding and patient toward aspects of my personality I don't like''), Self-Judgment (e.g., ''I'm disapproving and judgmental

49

about my own flaws and inadequacies''), Common Humanity (e.g., ''I try to see my failings as part of the human condition''), Isolation (e.g., ''When I think about my inadequacies it tends to make me feel more separate and cut off from the rest of the world''), Mindfulness (e.g., ''When something painful happens I try to take a balanced view of the situation''), and Over-Identification (e.g., ''When I'm feeling down I tend to obsess and fixate on everything that's wrong.''). Previous research (Neff 2003, Neff & Vonk, 2009) has shown that the SCS has appropriate factor structure and that a single factor of self-compassion explains the above six aspects. The scale has demonstrated convergent validity (e.g., correlates with therapist ratings), concurrent validity (e.g., correlates with social connectedness), discriminant validity (e.g., no correlation with social desirability), and test-retest reliability ($\alpha = .93$; Neff, 2003; Neff & Vonk, 2009).

Similar demographic questions were asked as in the previous two studies and the scales previously used for validating the humility scale in Study two which provided valuable information, were again included (i.e., the Narcissistic Personality Inventory, Religious Commitment Inventory-10, and the Satisfaction with Life Scale). The main purpose for study three was the continued analysis and validation of the Humility scale, with particular interest in determining what relationship there might be between it and the Neff Self-Compassion Scale.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Study 1

Study one was the initial assessment of the 60-item humility measure. Based on a review of the literature, in addition to the humility instrument, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Terry, 1988), Spiritual Well Being scale (Ellison, 1983), Faith Maturity scale (Benson et al. 1993), Empathy scale (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), Religious Maturity Scale (Dudley & Cruise, 1990), Religious commitment scale (Worthington et al., 2003) and Satisfaction with Life Scale (Pavot & Diener, 1993) were completed by a convenience sample of 95 students from a large public university and 25 students from a private, liberal arts college, both located in the southeastern United States. The participants signed-up for times to participate for minimal extra-credit in lower-level psychology classes. After completing a consent form, they completed the survey packet in groups of 8-10, with minimal supervision. Participants were informed that they would be answering questions about their self-understanding, their religiosity/spirituality, and their faith or non-faith commitments. They were asked to respond about their typical behaviors or tendencies, but there was no mention of humility or related concepts. This was in keeping with the idea that humility would be best measured implicitly.

Table 1 lists the means for Study 1, with no significant differences between females and males. The mean age of participants was 21.45, ranging from 18 to 60, with 55% being 20 years old or younger. Thirty percent were unaffiliated with a religious organization, with seventy percent indicating membership. Eighty-four percent of

51

participants were Caucasian, ten percent African-American, and ninety-four percent were single. The majority (53%) had only completed two years of college. The range of scores on the reduced, 32-item Humility scale was 88 to 114, with a normal distribution and a mean of 99.96.

Reliability analyses were run using Likert scaling corrected item-total correlations. This is the correlation between an item and the rest of the scale, without that item considered part of the scale. Without this correction, the correlation would be spuriously inflated, since it would count twice in the calculation of the correlation. The mean item-total correlation for the full humility scale was .243, and items with the lowest item-total correlations were eliminated until the mean rose above .35 (Drinnon, Jones, & Lawler, 2000; Neff, 2003). The final version of the scale retained 32 of the original 60 items, had a mean item-total correlation of .357, and a Cronbach's alpha of .842.

Then the humility scores were compared to the other measures, to begin the process of testing the validity of the scale. As shown in Table 5, the total humility score was negatively correlated to the Self-sufficiency subscale of the NPI ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$), which would seem to suggest divergent validity and positively correlated to religious maturity ($r = .24$, $p < .05$) which is suggestive of concurrent validity. Since most religions emphasize the virtue of humility, it would seem predictable that the more "religious" a person is, the greater their level of humility.

The relationships with the other NPI subscales were not significant, neither were there any other significant correlations between the Humility scale and the other scales included in the research packet (Faith Maturity Scale, Spiritual Well-being Scale). There were also no significant sex or age differences in humility scores.

52

The preliminary analyses would seem to indicate that the measure has acceptable reliability. The initial positive correlation with religious maturity and the negative correlation with an attitude of self-sufficiency would suggest that the measure may be a valid scale of humility.

Study 2

The purpose of Study 2 was to further test the revised Humility scale's reliability and validity. A convenience sample of 86 undergraduate students from a large public university, located in the southeastern United States signed up for times to participate in the study. Students earned minimal extra-credit in a lower-level psychology class for their participation in the research. After completing a consent form, they independently completed the survey packet in groups of 8-10. They were given an instruction page that informed them that they would be answering questions about their self-understanding, their religiosity/spirituality, and their faith or non-faith commitments. The questionnaire packets asked them to respond about their typical behaviors or tendencies, but there was no mention of humility or related concepts. They were not allowed to participate in this study if they had previously participated in Study 1.

In addition to the humility instrument, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Terry, 1988), Empathy scale (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), Religious commitment scale (Worthington et al., 2003), and Satisfaction with Life Scale (Pavot & Diener, 1993) were again a part of the research packet, just as they were in Study 1. In addition to the above, the following measures were new to Study 2: Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES; Campbell et al., 2004), Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (SES; Rosenberg, 1965), UCLA Loneliness Scale-Revised (LON; Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona,

1980), Forgiving Personality Inventory (FP; Drinnon, Jones, & Lawler, 2000), and the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-being (PWB; Ryff, 1989). The PWB scales measure total psychological well-being and the six dimensions of autonomy (AU), environmental mastery (EM), personal growth (PG), positive relations with others (PR), purpose in life (PL), and self-acceptance (SA).

Table 2 lists the means for Study 2, with again no significant differences between males and females. The mean age of the 86 participants was 19.27, ranging from 18 to 43, with 74% being 19 years old or younger, and 62% being college freshmen. Twenty-one percent were unaffiliated with a religious organization, with seventy-nine percent indicating membership. Fifty-five percent of participants were Caucasian, thirty percent African-American, and fourteen percent were Hispanic/Latino. Sixty-seven percent were not married and not in a relationship. The vast majority of Study 2 participants were late adolescent, and this may have impacted their understanding of humility, and how they responded to the other self-report measures. The range of Humility scores was 72 to 115 with a normal distribution and a mean of 96.74

Reliability analysis of the Humility scale's internal consistency remained good with a Cronbach's alpha of .791. As in Study 1, the humility scores were compared to the other measures, to test the validity of the scale. As seen in Table 6, the total humility score was negatively correlated to the self-sufficiency subscale of the NPI (r = -.21, p < .05), as well as the narcissistic entitlement subscale (r = -.23, p < .05) which would seem to suggest divergent validity. Humility was positively correlated to religious commitment (r = .35, p < .01) which is suggestive of concurrent validity.

Study 2 participants' scores on the Humility scale were not related to level of religious attendance ($r = .20$, *ns*) or frequency of prayer ($r = .01$, *ns*). The Psychological Entitlement scale and the Forgiving Personality Inventory, which were added for this study, also showed no significant relationship with humility (FPI: $r = .05$, *ns*; PES: $r = .04$, *ns*). There were also no significant gender or age differences in humility scores.

There was only one new relationship between the Humility scale and the new scales added for Study 2. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was negatively related to the Humility scale ($r = -.22$, p<.05). The Humility scale was not related to the Ryff Psychological Well-being subscale scores, nor was it related to the UCLA Loneliness Scale-Revised.

Study 3

The main purpose for Study 3 was the continued analysis and validation of the Humility scale, with particular interest in determining what, if any, relationship there might be between humility and the Neff Self-Compassion Scale. In addition to the humility instrument, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Terry, 1988), Religious commitment scale (Worthington et al., 2003), Satisfaction with Life Scale (Pavot & Diener, 1993), and Self-Compassion Scale (Neff, 2003) were completed by a convenience sample of 80 students from a private, liberal arts college, located in the southeastern United States. The participants signed-up for times to participate for minimal extra-credit in lower-level psychology classes. After completing a consent form, they completed the survey packet in groups of 8-10, with minimal supervision. Participants were informed that they would be answering questions about their self-understanding, their religiosity/spirituality, and their faith or non-faith commitments.

They were asked to respond about their typical behaviors or tendencies, but there was no

mention of humility or related concepts.

As shown in Table 3, the mean age of participants was 21.00, ranging from 17 to

49, with 79% being 21 years old or younger. Sixty-five percent of participants were

Caucasian, 16 percent African-American, and 6 percent Asian. The majority (65%) were

not married nor were they in a relationship, with 46% of the participants being males.

The reliability analysis of the Humility scale's internal consistency remained good with a

Cronbach's alpha of .784. The range of Humility scores was 68 to 131 with a normal

distribution and a mean of 101.94.

As stated previously, the main purpose of study 3 was to examine any possible

relationships between the concepts of humility and self-compassion as measured by

Neff's Self Compassion Scale and the humility scale. Neff (2003) defined self-

compassion based on three opposing dyads: (a) extending kindness and understanding to

the self in instances of pain or failure versus harsh judgment and self-criticism, (b) seeing

one's experiences as part of the larger human experience versus seeing them as

separating and isolating, and (c) holding one's painful thoughts and feelings in mindful

awareness versus over-identifying with them. The Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) has a

single factor score, as well as 6 subscale scores (i.e. Self-Kindness, Self-Judgment,

Common Humanity, Isolation, Mindfulness, and Over-Identification). The total humility

score (see Table 7) was not related to the total SCS score ($r = .06$, *ns*), but there were

three subscales that were related to humility. The Common Humanity subscale ($r = .23$,

p<.05) and the Isolation subscale ($r = .25$, p < .05) were positively related to humility

while the Self-Judgment subscale score ($r = -.39$, $p < .01$) was negatively related to humility. The other three subscales showed no significant relationships.

As in Study 2, humility was again positively related to religious commitment ($r = .45$, $p<.01$) and negative correlations between humility and three of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory subscales, and the overall NPI score approached significance ($r = -.21$, $p=.07$). The narcissistic exploitativeness subscale was negatively related to humility ($r = -.28$, $p<.05$), as were the narcissistic entitlement ($r = -.26$, $p<.05$) and self-sufficiency subscales ($r = -.22$, $p<.05$).

Principal Components Analysis

A Principal components analysis (PCA) was used to find which variables in the humility scale formed coherent subsets that are relatively independent from each other. These factors should reflect the underlying processes that have created correlations among the scale items. This data reduction technique further tested whether the scale was reliable and parsimonious. The previous Cronbach's alphas have shown the relative internal consistency of the 32-item scale, but were not sufficient to ensure the scale was measuring the intended concept of humility. For the purposes of the Principal components analysis, the scale item scores from Studies 2 and 3 were combined with the data from an additional, unrelated study of 251 participants, who took the 32-item humility scale. That gave an overall sample size of 417, and the samples were relatively similar based on gender, ethnicity, and geographical location (see Table 4 for means). There was an age difference between the participants of study 2 and 3 (M = 20.1), and the additional 251 participants (M = 63.3), but the difference between their humility scores was not significant (Study 2 and 3: M = 40.52, SD = 4.44, and older group: M = 40.69,

57

SD = 3.86; $t(412)$ = -.40, *ns*). Seventy-six percent of the combined sample size were Caucasian, 14% were African American, and 5% were Asian. Fifty-eight percent were females, and 51% reported being married.

The first measure of sampling adequacy revealed no problems with the factorability of the correlation matrix. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $X^2(496)$ = 2,508.19, p<.001, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .78, considered excellent (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003).

Examination of the Scree plot revealed a 9 component solution with 9 Eigen values greater than 1.0 based on an orthogonal rotation (Varimax) with 52.98% of the variance explained. This type of rotation ensured that all the components are uncorrelated with each other. Orthogonal rotation was used to help pull apart the variance between the individual items in order to create separate overarching components (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Component loadings less than .25 were suppressed so the table would be easier to read and interpret. Based on the component loadings, items 1, 5, 9, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, and 29 were deleted, either because they loaded on a component with fewer than 3 items, or the item cross-loaded too closely (<.2) on multiple components. (See Appendix B.)

The remaining items again underwent PCA with a 6 component solution revealed and 53% of the variance explained. The sampling adequacy was acceptable with a KMO of .74, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($X^2(190)$ = 1332.23, p<.001). Based on the component loadings, items 3, 4, 7, 30, and 31 were deleted because they loaded on a component with less than three items or were cross-loaded within .2 on multiple components.

A third PCA was run on the remaining 15 items with a four component solution and 49.75% of the variance explained. Sampling adequacy was good with a KMO of .73 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity significant (X^2(106) = 900.19, p<.001). All the scale items loaded acceptably on the four components (ranging from .34 - .78) and each component had at least three items. None of the 15 items cross-loaded within .2 on multiple components, indicating that these four provide an adequate explanation, though it would have been preferred to have more than 50% of the variance explained.

The next step was to examine the four components and determine whether the components, and their items made sense conceptually. The first component consisted of three reverse-scored items that reflected an openness to contradictory information, and learning from one's mistakes. The items were "When confronted with my mistakes, my first response is to explain why I did it," "When I get in trouble, it is important to me to be able to explain what happened," and " I am usually quick to rationalize my failures." Low scores on these items revealed being open to acknowledging one's imperfections and limitations, instead of feeling it necessary to justify his/her shortcomings.

The second component also consisted of three reverse-scored items and reflected a self-forgetfulness and relatively low self-focus. The items were "When I have put myself out for another, I want them to acknowledge my sacrifice," "When someone else is being recognized, I think about my accomplishments" and "It frustrates me, when others are praised and I am not." Low scores on these items demonstrated a freedom from self-absorption in one's own accomplishments and an ability to allow the attention to be on others.

A modest self-assessment comprised the third component which consisted of the following four items: "The challenges ahead of me often cause me to feel overwhelmed;" "I don't have my act together the way I'd like;" "Recently, I have felt ashamed of my arrogance;" and "I often wish I were as talented as my peers." These items reflected a modest self-assessment, especially in contrast to the traits of positive illusion and egocentric arrogance.

The fourth component consisted of five items that did not conceptually fit together as a whole, but represented two differing aspects of humility. The items, "I enjoy spending time reflecting on the majesty and power of nature" and "During times of prayer/meditation, I reflect on areas in my life where I need improvement" indicate an awareness of one's place as part of the larger universe. In contrast, the items, "I feel honored when others ask for my help," "I am deeply touched when others sacrifice for me," and "I feel valuable doing "lowly" things for others," represent a focus on others. Due to this conceptual differentiation, the two items (2,10) indicating an awareness of one's place in the larger whole were deleted and another PCA was run. This fourth PCA with Varimax rotation on the remaining 13 items now explained 53.87% of the variance, meeting the level of acceptability. Sampling adequacy remained good with a KMO of .73 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity significant ($X^2(78) = 785.97$, p<.001).

In order to make sure the best rotation method was used, correlations among the four components were examined. While there were significant (p<.01) correlations among the four components, none was above .27, meaning that the orthogonal rotation used was the best choice. A Cronbach's alpha was also run on each of the four components to examine internal consistency.

The component loadings are shown in Table 8. The first component, openness ($\propto$ = .60) had an Eigen value of 2.92 and accounted for 22.44% of the variance. The component, self-forgetfulness ($\propto$ = .64), had an Eigen value of 1.63 and accounted for 12.57% of the variance. The third component, modest self-assessment ($\propto$ =.63), had an Eigen value of 1.30 and accounted for 9.99% of the variance. The component focus on others ($\propto$ = .37), had an Eigen value of 1.15 and accounted for 8.87% of the variance. Overall, the rotated four component solution of the humility scale accounted for 53.8% of the variance. While the amount of variance explained by the four components was good, the low alphas (especially of the focus on others component) were indicative of a lack of internal consistency.

As shown in Table 4, the mean age for the combined sample was 46.20, with 172 males and 245 females. The 32-item Humility Scale mean was 99.54, and was normally distributed (range 74 to 127). The 13-item Humility scale mean was 40.63, and was also normally distributed (range 26 to 53). After isolating the four principal components of openness, self-forgetfulness, modest self-assessment, and focus on others, the data from the previous three studies were re-examined. Table 9 shows the correlations among the humility subscales and the other scales used in Study 1. The openness subscale was positively related to empathy (r = .29, $p < .01$, and unrelated to any other measure. Self-forgetfulness was positively related to religious maturity (r = .24, $p < .05$), the three NPI subscales of authoritative (r = .20, $p < .05$), exhibitionism (r = .30, $p < .01$), and entitlement (r = .26, $p < .01$) and empathy (r = .32, $p < .01$). Modest self-assessment was positively related to empathy (r = .38, $p < .01$) and negatively related to satisfaction with life (r = -.35, $p < .01$) and the three NPI subscales of authoritative (r = -.22, $p < .05$), self-

sufficiency ($r = -.25$, p < .01), and exhibitionism ($r = -.18$, p < .05). Last the focus on

others subscale was positively related to religious commitment ($r = .25$, p < .05), faith

maturity ($r = .27$, p < .01) and empathy ($r = .50$, p < .01).

Table 10 shows the correlations with the humility subscales and the scales used in

Study 2. Openness was negatively related to the self-sufficiency subscale of the NPI ($r =$

$-.23$, p < .05) and positively related to empathy ($r = .34$, p < .01). Self-forgetfulness was

positively related to the superiority and exhibitionism subscales of the NPI ($r = .25$, p <

.05; $r = .26$, p < .05), as well as to empathy ($r = .26$, p < .05). It was negatively related to

psychological entitlement ($r = -.32$, p < .01) Modest self-assessment was positively

related to loneliness ($r = .45$, p < .01) and empathy ($r = .27$, p < .05). It was negatively

related to satisfaction with life ($r = -.30$, p < .01), psychological well-being ($r = -.41$, p <

.01) and self-esteem ($r = -.58$, p < .01). The focus on others component was positively

related to religious commitment ($r = .33$, p < .01), psychological well-being ($r = .30$, p <

.01), forgiving personality ($r = .35$, p < .01), and empathy ($r = .47$, p < .01). It was

negatively related to psychological entitlement ($r = -.25$, p < .05).

As seen in Table 11, bivariate correlations were also run on the four components

of the humility scale, and the subscales of the Self-Compassion Scale and the Narcissistic

Personality Inventory used in Study 3. Openness was negatively related to the Common

Humanity subscale ($r = -.24$, p <.05) with no other significant correlations. The self-

forgetfulness component was negatively related to the three NPI subscales of

exhibitionism ($r = -.30$, p > .01), vanity ($r = -0.23$, p < .05), and entitlement ($r = -.30$, p <

.01). Modest self-assessment was negatively related to the Self-Compassion subscales of

self-judgment ($r = -.35$, p<.01) and over identification with one's mistakes ($r = -.26$, p <

.05). It was also negatively related to the NPI authoritative subscale ($r = -.29$, p $< .01$), and satisfaction with life ($r = -.23$, p $< .05$). The focus on others component was positively related to the common humanity ($r = .32$, p $<.01$) and mindfulness ($r = .25$, p $<.05$) Self-Compassion subscales. It was negatively related to the NPI subscales of exhibitionism ($r = -.24$, p $< .05$), exploitativeness ($r = -.43$, p $< .01$), vanity ($r= -.23$, p $<$ .05), and entitlement (r $= -.45$, p $< .01$). In total, all of these relationships support the validity of the four principal components of the present Humility scale. The multiple negative relationships with the NPI subscales as well as the relative few relationships with the Self-Compassion subscales indicate that the Humility scale measures a unique concept, and is opposite in content from narcissism. Three of the four components (all except openness) were negatively related to multiple NPI subscales, providing additional divergent validity. The focus on others positive relationships with the Self-Compassion subscales of Mindfulness and Common Humanity are to be expected as it requires the ability to be cognitively aware of and sensitive to others' needs if one is to have a focus on others.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

As stated previously, if positive psychology is going to continue to be an important, viable aspect of scientific psychology, then its various components must be rigorously and systematically examined and more adequately understood. Humility, as a character strength, is one example of such a concept that needs definition and examination in such a scientific manner. The current study has endeavored to do just that, by developing a self-report humility scale that is theoretically sound, and has begun the process of demonstrating its reliability and validity.

Humility has often been viewed as a negative characteristic, but its potential importance in interpersonal relations makes it an important concept to examine. This study has proposed a way to explicitly assess aspects of humility with a self-report scale. We found that humility was viewed positively by a majority of participants and scale items were developed based on those positive perceptions of humility. This process aided in deriving potential questions that would measure humility without explicitly asking one to assess their own level of humility.

The original humility scale had 60 items, and 28 items were deleted using Likert scaling item-total correlations. The revised 32-item scale showed acceptable reliability and in relationships with measures of religiosity and narcissism, some indication of being a valid assessment of humility. Overall, the scale demonstrated divergent validity through negative correlations with three subscales (Self-Sufficiency, Exploitativeness, and Entitlement) of the NPI. Convergent validity was shown through relationships with various measures of religiosity (RMS, and R-10), empathy, and the Common Humanity

component of the Self-Compassion Scale. A Principal component analysis revealed a four principal solution best fit the data and explained a good amount of variance, and kept 13 items. The Cronbach's alphas were low, but acceptable for the openness, modest self-assessment, and self-forgetfulness components, but the focus on others component lacked acceptable reliability. On the other hand, the focus on others component was most strongly validated by consistent associations with NPI, SCS, religiosity, psychological well-being, and empathy.

The results indicate that the present Humility scale is assessing a unique dispositional attribute that is conceptually linked to the commonly-held theoretical definition of humility. The four components, comprised of 13 items adequately cover Tangney's (2000) conceptualization of the multi-faceted structure of humility. The past, and present difficulty of assessing humility as a unitary concept may be that it should be understood as being comprised of distinct aspects, and may not be easily grasped as a singular whole, but rather as having distinctive, and varied contributing aspects.

The four components of openness, self-forgetfulness, modest self-assessment, and focus on others, roughly parallel the following definitive attributes of humility: an openness to new ideas, contradictory information, and advice, with the ability to acknowledge one's mistakes; relatively low self-focus, a "forgetting of the self"; a modest assessment of one's abilities and achievements, and keeping them in perspective in relation to the world around them; and finally an appreciation of the many different ways that others can and do contribute to the greater good. Without directly asking one to assess their own humility (a problematic situation when addressing the topic of humility), the present scale adequately covers the richness of the concept, and yet does so without

65

prompting a "false" humility or pride. The scale should be a helpful tool in promoting the further study of this important topic and will provide an impetus in the areas of positive psychology and forgiveness.

Explaining the Humility/Subjective Well-being Relationship

At first perusal, the scale's negative relationship with various measures of subjective and psychological well-being may appear to be of concern. If humility is such an important virtue then why isn't it associated with happiness or positive mental states? There are several possible explanations. High self-esteem and a propensity toward a more positive-illusion view of life have both been linked to higher scores on subjective and psychological well-being. Since humility, by definition, requires an accurate self-assessment, it would be contradictory to a positive-illusion or unrealistic mindset often positively related to subjective well-being. That said, humility may be negatively correlated, or unrelated to measures of subjective and psychological well-being. Certainly the study by Exline and Geyer (2004) also found no association with views on humility and self-esteem, and negative relationships with narcissism. Thus, more humble persons may not have worse psychological well-being, but may be more aware of their life realities and, therefore, more honest in their self-evaluations. This view would seem to be supported in the Ashton et al. (2004) study that suggested honesty and humility are co-characteristics of a proposed sixth personality factor.

Another possible explanation is that greater humility is related to decreased psychological well-being. It has been argued previously in this paper that humility is not the same as low self-esteem nor is it the same as humiliation; however, it is possible that the present Humility scale may be measuring certain aspects of low self-esteem and

66

partially assessing characteristics of humiliation. The problem of separating the virtuous qualities of humility from the hurtful aspects of shame and humiliation has plagued past efforts at creating a measure of humility, and may be adversely affecting the present humility scale development. It may also be that the relationships of humility and well-being may change with age. As people get older, and have more to be genuinely humble about, perhaps humility will be more positively related to well-being, as opposed to a late adolescent sample which has no clear area of expertise.

Theoretical Implications

The present study found a similar positive perception of humility as found by Exline and Geyer (2004). The methodology of deriving potential scale items from participants' stories of humbling experiences, while based on what they had done, also extended it through creation of an actual Humility scale. It was also confirmed that when asked of a time they felt humble, persons generally recalled more positive incidents rather than humiliating experiences. This affirms the virtuous quality of humility as being able to be a learning and growth experience, even when going through a difficult circumstance.

Though there was a relationship between religious commitment and humility, there was none between humility and measures of religious activity, such as church attendance, religious membership, and prayer. A previous attempt (Rowatt et al. 2002, Rowatt et al. 2006) at measuring humility struggled with separating low humility from those who were only accurately stating their superiority over others. Humility does not mean being unable to recognize one's abilities or achievements, but rather to be able to

keep them in proper perspective. The present humility scale better assessed this accurate, or at least modest, self-perception, without a bias against achievement or success.

Finally, the present measure of humility demonstrated sufficient differentiation from the related concept of self-compassion as assessed by Neff's (2003) Self-Compassion Scale so as to be a separate contribution to the literature. The lone correlations were positive relationships to the Common Humanity and Mindfulness subscales (by the Focus on others component), and negative relationships to the Over Identification and Self-Judgment subscales (by the modest self-assessment component). The Common Humanity subscale is the one piece of the self-compassion definition that most closely resembles the universal perspective aspect of humility. Self-compassionate persons view their experiences as part of the larger human experience, while humble persons would recognize they are but part of the larger universe and would appreciate the differing contributions of others to the greater whole. These aspects of self-compassion and humility are quite similar and it would be expected that they would be positively related. In being negatively related to Over Identification and Self-Judgment, more humble persons were not consumed with their life struggles, nor did they need to spend excessive cognitive energy focusing on themselves. Self-compassion is different from humility in that it is more self-focused, while humility is other focused, yet they are similar in that both require a mindful, self-awareness.

Limitations and Future Directions

The expansiveness and richness of the term humility has made it difficult to capture as a unified concept. Whether it is trying to winnow out the conditions of shame and humiliation, or trying to adequately cover the virtuous qualities of humility, attempts

to define humility and to effectively measure it have not been successful. The present study has attempted to provide a parsimonious instrument that has theoretical and practical value.

Several limitations of the present investigation must be noted. First, the participants for the initial scale development and analysis were all American college students, and were primarily Caucasian. For a concept such as humility, it is hazardous to generalize across cultural boundaries, especially in so far as other cultures may have different norms regarding humility.

The primary aim in this set of studies was to examine humility as a trait rather than as a state. The situational assessment of humility would also be helpful by supplying answers as to what situational factors encourage or discourage humble behaviors. It would also shed light as to what impact humility has on others and situations. The effect of humility on others is not fully understood, and research into these areas is needed to fully grasp its positive or negative impacts. It might be possible to use the present Humility scale to measure one's level of humility after being exposed to potentially "humbling" events or circumstances that were controlled or provided in an experimental setting.

As stated previously, humility has been proposed as a precursor to forgiveness. While only the Focus on others component showed any relationship to a forgiving personality in Study 2, it would be interesting to examine whether Humility is related to situational measures of forgiveness. In future studies where forgiveness interventions are taught, the present humility scale would be helpful in better understanding the components of humility that might need to be highlighted, specifically in how they might

69

affect the offering or seeking of forgiveness. The scale component of openness to one's own faults or mistakes would seem especially helpful. If a person is struggling to forgive another for his/her failure or weakness, then one way to encourage forgiveness might be to help them see his/her own failures and weaknesses and need for forgiveness. The self-forgetfulness and focus on others components would indicate whether or not the person had a tendency toward being more mindful of self-concerns or self-interests, versus being cognizant of the needs and concerns of the other. In practice, persons high in self-forgetfulness or focus on others should be more likely to forgive or forgive more easily than those who are not, and this was confirmed in Study 2 by focus on others' correlation with a forgiving personality.

There are many additional avenues for the study of humility that the present scale should help to advance. For instance, does humility follow a developmental sequence? The precociousness of the young child is usually considered a good thing for their pursuit of continued cognitive and emotional development, but when does the "childishness" become unhealthy egotism or pride? Does humility change during adolescence, young adulthood or late adulthood? These and other life-span development questions provide much room for future research into humility. There has been some research into the causes and development of narcissism, and similarly research into humility's development could discover its relationship to parental involvement and nurturing, as well as possible relationships to traumatic life events or successful accomplishments.

Humility has been a notoriously difficult concept to measure, and the present study would support that conclusion. As has been stated before, it may be that humility defies the logic of being a singular unit, but is best understood by its component parts.

70

The Humility scale as developed has shown that it adequately covers the conceptual definition of humility and has shown divergent and concurrent validity. What is lacking is the kind of reliability that would give us confidence that it is consistently measuring what it is supposed to be measuring. It may be that additional questions could be added to the present scale to see if reliability would be enhanced, especially with the focus on others component. In addition, it may be helpful to add questions to the two items that were deleted from that component, in order to assess the idea of reflection on one's universal connectivity. It might also be beneficial to compare reliability based on test-retest comparisons. Either way, the present Humility scale provides a workable instrument to continue the advancement of our knowledge of this important character virtue.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 5,* 432-443.

Altemeyer, B. & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2,* 113-133.

Asendorpf, J. B., Banse, R., & Mucke, D. (2002). Double dissociation between implicit and explicit personality self-concept: The case of shy behavior. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 83,* 380-393.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Perugini, M., Szarota, P., de Vries, R. E., Di Blas, L., Boies, K., & De Raad, B. (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: Solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 86,* 356-366.

Batson, C. D., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991). Measuring religion as quest: 2) Reliability concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30,* 430-447.

Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P. A., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Baumeister, R. F., & Exline, J. J. (1999). Virtue, personality, and social relations: Self-control as the moral muscle. *Journal of Personality 67*, 1165-1194.

Baumeister R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review,* 103, 5-33.

Benson, P. L., Donahue, M. J., & Erickson, J. A. (1993). The Faith Maturity Scale:

       Conceptualization, measurement, and empirical validation. *Research in the Social*

       Scientific Study of Religion, 5, 1-26.

Buri, John R. (1988). The nature of humankind, authoritarianism, and self-esteem,

       Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 7, 32-37.

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-

       esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to

       violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 75, 219-229.

Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004).

       Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-

       report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 83,* 29-45.

Chittister, J. D. (1991). Wisdom Distilled from the Daily. Living the Rule of St.

       Benedict Today. San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Cialdini, R. B., Wosinska, W., Dabul, A. J., Whetstone-Dion, R., & Heszen, I. (1998).

       When role salience leads to social role rejection: Modest self-presentation among

       women and men in two cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,*

       473-481.

Compton, William C., (2001). Toward a tripartite factor structure of mental health:

       Subjective well-being, personal growth, and religiosity. *The Journal of*

       Psychology, 135, 486-500.

DeNeve, K. M. (2000). General religiousness scale development and validation.

       Manuscript in preparation.

Diener, E. (1984) Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 93*, 542-575.

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist, 55,* 34-43.

Diener, E. Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 71-75.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125,* 276-302.

Drinnon, J. R., Jones, W. H., & Lawler, K. A. (2000). *Measurements of forgiveness.* Paper presented at the Society of Personality and Social Psychology, Nashville, TN.

Dudley, R. L., & Cruise, R. J. (1990). Measuring religious maturity: A proposed scale. *Review of Religious Research, 32,* 97-109.

Ellison, C. W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11,* 330-340.

Ellison, C. W. & Smith, J. (1991). Toward an integrative measure of health and well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19,* 35-48.

Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48,* 291-300.

Emmons, R. A. (1999). *The psychology of ultimate concerns.* New York: Guilford.

Emmons, R. A. & Paloutzian, R. F. (2003) The psychology of religion. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54,* 377-402.

Enright, R. D. (2001). *Forgiveness is a choice.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Exline, J.J. (2008). Taming the wild ego. In J.A. Bauer & H.A. Wayment (Eds.), Transcending self-interest: Psychological explorations of the quiet ego (pp.53-62). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Exline, J. J., Baumeister, R., Bushman, B., Campbell, W. K., & Finkel, E. (2004a). Too proud to let go: Narcissistic entitlement as a barrier to forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87,* 894-912.

Exline, J. J., Campbell, W. K., Baumeister, R. F., Joiner, T., & Krueger, J. (2004b). Humility and modesty. In C. Peterson & M. Seligman (Eds.), *The Values In Action (VIA) classification of strengths.* Cincinnati, OH: Values in Action Institute.

Exline, J. J. & Geyer, A. L. (2004). Perceptions of humility: A preliminary Study. *Self and Identity, 3*: 95-114.

Exline, J. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hill, P., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Forgiveness and justice: A research agenda for social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*, 337-348.

Gaertner, L., Sedikides, C., & Graetz, K. (1999). In search of self-definition: Motivational primacy of the individual self, motivational primacy of the collective self, or contextual primacy? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 5-18.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 59,* 1216-1229.

Greenwald, A. G., & Farnham, S. D. (2000). Using the implicit association test to measure self-esteem and self-concept. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 79,* 1022-1038.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. F., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74,* 1464-1480.

Gregg, A. P., Hart, C. M., Sedikides, C., & Kumashiro, M. (2008). Everyday conceptions of modesty: A prototype analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34,* 978-992.

Hammermeister, J., & Peterson, M. (200l). Does spirituality make a difference? Psychosocial and health-related characteristics of spiritual well-being. *American Journal of Health Education, 32,* 293-297.

Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1997). Love and satisfaction. In R. J.Sternberg & M.Hojjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in close relationships* (pp. 56–78). New York: Guilford Press

Jennings, L., Sovereign, A., Bottorff, N., Mussell, M. P., & Vye, C. (2005). Nine ethical values of master therapists. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27,* 32-47.

Kunz, G. (2002). Simplicity, humility, and patience. In R. N. Williams & E. E. Gantt (Eds.), *Psychology for the other: Levinas, ethics and the practice of psychology* (pp 118-142). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Lawler-Row, K. A., & Elliott, J. (2009). The role of religious activity and spirituality in the health and well-being of older adults. *Journal of Health Psychology, 14,* 39-48.

Means, J. R., Wilson, G. L., Sturm, C., & Biron, J. E. (1990). Humility as a psychotherapeutic formulation. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly 3*, 211-215.

Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality, 40,* 525-543.

Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist, 55* 56-67.

Myers, D. G. (1998). The psychology of humility. In R. L. Hermann (Ed.) *Ten scientists consider humility theology*. Philadelphia, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

Myers, D. G. (1992). *The Pursuit of Happiness.* New York: Avon Books.

Neff, K. D. (2003). The development and validation of a scale to measure self-Compassion. *Self and Identity, 2,* 223-250.

Neff, K. D., & Vonk, R. (2009). Self-compassion versus global self-esteem: Two different ways of relating to oneself. *Journal of Personality, 77,* 1, 23-50.

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23,* 603-619.

Paulhus, D. L. (1988). Assessing self-deception and impression management in self-reports: The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. Unpublished manual. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia.

Pavot, W. & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Psychological Assessment, 5,* 164-172.

Peabody, D. & De Raad, B. (2002). The substantive nature of psycholexical personality

    factors: A comparison across languages. *Journal of Personality & Social*

    Psychology, 83, 983-997.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook*

    and classification. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; New

    York: Oxford University Press

Pett, M.A., Lackey, N.R., & Sullivan, J.J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: The*

    use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research.

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Raskin, R. & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic

    Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 890-902.

Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *The*

    Leadership Quarterly, 16, 655-687.

Roberts, R. C. (1983). *Spirituality and Human Emotion.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B.

    Eerdmans Publishing

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton

    University Press.

Rowatt, W. C., Ottenbreit, A., Nesselroade, Jr., K. P., & Cunningham, P. A. (2002). On

    being holier-than-thou or humbler-than-thee: A social psychological perspective

    on religiousness and humility. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41,*

    227-237.

Rowatt, W. C., Powers, C., Targhetta, V., Comer, J., Kennedy, S., & Labouf, J. (2006). Development and initial validation of an implicit measure of humility relative to arrogance. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 1,* 198-211.

Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,* 472-480.

Ryan, D. S. (1983). Self-Esteem: An operational definition and ethical analysis, *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11,* 295-302.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Beyond Ponce de Leon and life satisfaction: New directions in quest of successful aging. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 12,* 35-55.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 719-727.

Sandage, S. J. (1997). An Ego-humility model of forgiveness. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation. Virginia Commonwealth University.

Sandage, S. J., & Wiens, T. W. (2001). Contextualizing models of humility and forgiveness: A reply to Gassin. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 29,* 201-211.

Sandage, S. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hight, T. L., & Berry, J. W. (2000). Seeking forgiveness: Theoretical context and an initial empirical study. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 25*, 21-35.

Scherwitz, L., & Canick, J. C. (1988). Self-reference and coronary heart disease risk. In B. K. Houston & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Type A behavior pattern: Research, theory, and intervention* (pp. 146-167). New York: Wiley.

Sedikides, C., & Strube, M. J. (1997). Self-evaluation: To thine own self be good, to

    thine own self be sure, to thine own self be true and to thine own self be better. In

    M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, 29,* 209-269.

Seligman, M. E. P. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An

    introduction. *American Psychology 55*, 5-14.

Snyder, C. R. & McCullough, M. E. (2000). A positive psychology field of dreams:

    "If you build it, they will come…" *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,*

    19, 151-160.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston:

    Allyn & Bacon.

Tangney, J. P. (2000). Humility: Theoretical perspectives, empirical findings and

    directions for future research, *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19,* 70-

    82.

Tangney, J. P. (2002). Humility. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.). *Handbook of*

    Positive psychology (pp. 411-419). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological

    perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 103,* 193-210.

Templeton, J. M. (1997). *Worldwide laws of life: Two hundred eternal spiritual*

    principles. Radnor, PA: Templeton Press.

Tice, D. M., Butler, J. L., Muraven, M. B., & Stillwell, A. M. (1995). When modesty

    prevails: Differential favorability of self-presentation to friends and strangers.

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 1120-1138.

Vera, D. & Rodriguez-Lopez, A. (2004). Strategic virtues: Humility as a source

of competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics, 33,* 393-408.

Watson, P. J., & Morris, R. J., & Miller, L. (1997). Narcissism and the self as

continuum: Correlations with assertiveness and hypercompetitiveness.

Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 17, 249-259.

Witvliet, C. v. O., Hinze, S. R., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2008). Unresolved injustice:

Christian religious commitment, forgiveness, revenge, and cardiovascular

responding. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 27,* 110-119.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1998). An empathy-humility-commitment model of forgiveness

applied within family dyads. *Journal of Family Therapy, 20, 59-76.*

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2006). Just Forgiving: How the Psychology and Theology of

Forgiveness and Justice Inter-relate. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity 25,*

155-168.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2008). Humility: The quiet virtue. *Journal of Psychology and*

Christianity, 27, 270-273.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. & Scherer, M. (2004). Forgiveness is an emotion-focused coping

strategy that can reduce health risks and promote health: Theory, review, and

hypotheses. *Psychology and Health, 19*, 385-405.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., McCullough, M. E.,

Berry, J. W., Schmitt, M. M., Berry, J. T., Bursley, K. H., & O'Conner, L. O.

(2003). The Religious Commitment Inventory-10: Development, refinement, and

validation of a brief scale for research and counseling. *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 50, 84-96.

Zausner, Toki, (2003). Humility, empathy, and rebirth: The dynamics of Ferenczi's

metapsychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 43,* 46-58.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table 1

Study 1 Table of Means

Item	Male (SD)	Female (SD)	Total (SD)
Num	38	81	119
Age	22.05 (5.28)	21.17 (5.14)	21.45 (5.18)
Hum	98.83 (5.89)	100.57 (5.22)	99.96 (5.48)
Pry	2.94 (1.07)	2.93 (1.11)	2.94 (1.10)
NPI	14.37 (5.20)	13.78 (6.67)	13.97 (6.19)
CIN	4.92 (2.27)	4.99 (2.27)	4.97 (2.26)
FMS	171.95 (25.00)	180.15 (26.45)	177.53 (26.06)
RMS	25.79 (7.26)	26.59 (6.53)	26.38 (6.74)
SPB	96.63 (14.61)	97.51 (13.72)	97.27 (13.90)
EMP	64.11 (9.19)	69.40 (7.86)	67.68 (8.60)
R10	32.63 (9.28)	31.79 (10.77)	32.01 (10.26)
SWB	25.79 (6.41)	25.03 (7.12)	25.31 (6.86)

Hum = 32-item Humility scale; Pry = how often they pray; NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CIN = church involvement; FMS = Faith Maturity Scale; RMS = Religious Maturity Scale; SPB = Spiritual Well-being scale; EMP = empathy scale; R10 = Religious commitment; SWB = Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Table 2

Study 2 Table of Means

Item	Males (SD)	Females (SD)	Total (SD)
Num	31	55	86
Age	20.26 (4.54)	18.71 (1.38)	19.27 (3.01)
Hum	96.55 (7.38)	96.85 (5.32)	96.74 (6.10)
FPI	130.29 (11.61)	135.44 (13.06)	133.58 (12.73)
Pry	4.55 (1.91)	4.00 (1.75)	4.20 (1.82)
NPI	16.83 (6.25)	14.50 (7.09)	15.33 (6.85)
PWB	379.5 (32.14)	400.7 (37.37)	393.1 (36.84)
Lon	39.55 (11.53)	33.31 (8.04)	35.59 (9.87)
PES	29.68 (8.74)	25.09 (9.74)	26.74 (9.60)
SES	29.03 (4.84)	30.20 (4.37)	29.78 (4.56)
EMP	66.29 (6.78)	70.93 (7.59)	69.26 (7.61)
R10	28.32 (10.78)	28.31 (10.54)	28.31 (10.56)
SWB	21.52 (6.13)	25.51 (5.20)	24.07 (5.84)

Hum = 32-item Humility scale; FPI = Forgiving Personality Inventory; Pry = how often they pray; NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; PWB = Ryff's Psychological Well-being scale; Lon = UCLA Loneliness Scale; PES = Psychological Entitlement Scale; SES = Rosenburg's Self-esteem Scale; EMP = Empathy Scale; R10 = Religious commitment inventory; SWB = Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Table 3

Study 3 Table of Means

Item	Male (SD)	Female (SD)	Total (SD)
Num	37	43	80
Age	21.27 (5.26)	20.77 (3.50)	21.00 (4.38)
Hum	96.56 (12.97)	106.44 (11.75)	101.94 (12.18)
NPI	18.19 (7.11)	12.23 (5.43)	14.99 (6.90)
SCS	19.63 (2.59)	19.28 (2.22)	19.45 (2.39)
R10	31.65 (8.11)	38.35 (6.84)	35.25 (8.13)
SWB	23.73 (5.99)	24.42 (5.85)	24.10 (5.88)
HO	7.83 (2.27)	7.67 (2.37)	7.75 (2.31)
HSF	9.56 (2.32)	9.81 (2.30)	9.70 (2.30)
HAS	10.83 (3.49)	12.28 (3.13)	11.62 (3.36)
HOF	10.92 (2.16)	12.35 (2.06)	11.70 (2.21)

Hum = 32-item Humility Scale; NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; SCS = Self-compassion scale; R10 = Religious commitment inventory; SWB = Satisfaction with Life scale; HO = openness subscale; HSF = Self-forgetfulness subscale; HAS = Accurate self-assessment subscale; HOF = focus on others subscale.

Table 4

<center>Study 4 Table of Means</center>

Item	Male(SD)	Female(SD)	Total(SD)
Num	172	245	417
Age	46.33 (21.75)	46.07 (22.49)	46.20 (22.14)
Hum	98.88 (6.29)	99.98 (6.29)	99.54 (6.46)
H13	40.01 (4.11)	41.06 (4.04)	40.63 (4.09)

Hum = 32-item Humility Scale; H13 = 13-item Humility Scale.

Table 5
Study 1 Correlations

Measure	HUM	R10	SWB	NAU	NSS	NSP	NEX	NEP	NV	NEN	EMP	FMS	RMS	SPW	CIN	PRY
HUM	--															
R10	.07	--														
SWB	-.17	-.09	--													
NAU	-.06	-.14	.06	--												
NSS	-.18*	-.28**	.14	.34**	--											
NSP	-.09	.10	-.05	.31**	.19*	--										
NEX	-.11	-.15	.08	.36**	.21*	.37**	--									
NEP	-.12	-.22*	-.01	.32**	.24*	.15	.42**	--								
NV	-.06	-.20*	-.03	.23*	.16	.40**	.51**	.25**	--							
NEN	-.16	-.17	-.22*	.36**	.30**	.42**	.36**	.41**	.34**	--						
EMP	.15	.21*	.00	.27*	.16	.27*	.18	.12	.23*	.22*	--					
FMS	.16	.78**	-.01	.06	.28*	-.08	-.11	.03	.12	.02	.27**	--				
RMS	.24*	-.22*	.13	.05	-.02	-.02	.06	-.06	.00	-.12	.22*	-.08	--			
SPW	-.02	.66**	.22*	-.31**	-.12	-.10	-.02	.05	-.15	.12	.13	.67**	-.21*	--		
CIN	.01	.73**	-.16	.08	.13	.09	.08	.00	.06	.01	.12	.58**	-.32**	.48**	--	
PRY	-.04	.58**	-.14	-.12	.20	-.09	-.05	-.05	-.02	-.08	.08	.50**	-.20*	.42**	.56**	--

HUM = humility; R10 = religious commitment; SWB = satisfaction with life scale; NAU = authority; NSS = self-sufficiency; NSP = superiority; NEX = exhibitionism; NEP = exploitativeness; NV = vanity; NEN = entitlement; EMP = empathy; FMS = faith maturity scale; RMS = religious maturity scale; SPW = spiritual well-being; CIN = church involvement; PRY = how often they pray.

*p<.05. **p<.01.

Table 6
Study 2 Correlations

Measure	HUM	R10	SWB	NAU	NSS	NSP	NEX	NEP	NV	NEN	AU	EM	PG	PR	PI	SA	FPI	PES	LON	EMP	SES
HUM	--																				
R10	.35**	--																			
SWB	-.07	.12	--																		
NAU	-.09	.14	.14	--																	
NSS	-.21*	-.08	.34**	.29**	--																
NSP	-.16	.05	-.01	.25*	.14	--															
NEX	-.13	.07	.25*	.37**	.13	.38**	--														
NEP	-.12	.04	.12	.48**	.23*	.17	.42**	--													
NV	-.03	-.03	.12	.08	-.04	.51**	.45**	.04	--												
NEN	-.23*	-.02	-.24*	.35**	.22*	.47**	.19	.32**	.30**	--											
AU	-.11	.14	.18	.18	.05	-.02	.22*	.20	-.07	-.06	--										
EM	-.09	.27*	.62**	.18	.29**	.16	.12	.09	.13	-.12	.34**	--									
PG	.05	.21	.42**	.06	.13	.11	.08	-.03	.22*	-.06	.39**	.63**	--								
PR	-.14	.27*	.52**	.12	.15	.13	.12	-.07	.07	-.09	.40**	.60**	.72**	--							
PI	-.13	.29**	.65**	.16	.30**	.25*	.18	.14	.16	-.07	.33**	.77**	.76**	.76**	--						
SA	-.17	.15	.66**	.09	.17	.19	.08	-.06	.23*	-.13	.34**	.76**	.70**	.70**	.79**	--					
FPI	.05	.38**	.17	-.01	-.16	-.09	-.04	-.19	-.06	-.13	.49**	.25*	.45**	.44**	.36**	.31**	--				
PES	.04	.07	-.06	.20	.22*	.34**	.16	.07	.19	.31**	-.19	-.10	-.31**	-.27*	-.12	-.14	-.32**	--			
LON	.20	-.07	-.56**	-.14	-.19	-.09	-.18	.01	-.15	.11	-.21	-.50**	-.40**	-.52**	-.53**	-.60**	-.17	.09	--		
EMP	.11	.26*	.08	-.07	-.23*	.00	.10	-.03	-.03	-.08	.21	.01	.22*	.38**	.29**	.10	.36**	-.10	-.03	--	
SES	-.22*	.23*	.53**	.22*	.15	.36**	.21	.03	.37**	.05	.11	.61**	.43**	.48**	.67**	.70**	.26*	.07	-.58**	.10	--

HUM = humility; R10 = religious commitment; SWB = satisfaction with life scale; NAU = authority; NSS = self-sufficiency; NSP = superiority; NEX = exhibitionism; NEP = exploitativeness; NV = vanity; NEN = entitlement; AU = autonomy; EM = environmental mastery; PG = personal growth; PR = personal relations with others; PI = purpose in life; SA = self-acceptance; FPI forgiveness personality inventory; PES = psychological entitlement scale; LON = loneliness; EMP = empathy; SES = self-esteem scale. *p<.05. **p<.01.

Table 7
Study 3 Correlations

Measure	HUM	R10	SWB	NAU	NSS	NSP	NEX	NEP	NV	NEN	SK	SJ	CH	IS	MI	OI
HUM	--															
R10	.45**	--														
SWB	.09	.08	--													
NAU	-.19	-.08	-.07	--												
NSS	-.22*	-.30**	-.07	.40**	--											
NSP	-.05	.15	-.15	.38**	.25*	--										
NEX	.12	-.08	-.16	.36**	.29**	.40**	--									
NEP	-.28*	-.42**	-.11	.19	.28*	.15	.42**	--								
NV	-.16	-.30**	-.15	.38**	.32**	.35**	.61**	.50**	--							
NEN	-.26*	-.25*	-.22	.36**	.38**	.36**	.56**	.51**	.42**	--						
SK	.00	-.09	.15	.27*	.16	.27*	.18	.12	.23*	.22*	--					
SJ	-.39**	-.30**	.00	.06	.28*	-.08	-.11	.03	.12	.02	.22*	--				
CH	.23*	.14	.17	.05	-.02	-.02	.06	-.06	.00	-.12	.47**	.16	--			
IS	.25*	.10	.11	-.31**	-.12	-.10	-.02	.05	-.15	.12	-.14	-.06	-.07	--		
MI	.17	-.08	.27*	.08	.13	.09	.08	.00	.06	.01	.50**	.14	.56**	.05	--	
OI	-.07	-.13	.24*	-.12	.20	-.09	-.05	-.05	-.02	-.08	.20	.23*	.30**	.07	.52**	--

HUM = humility; R10 = religious commitment; SWB = satisfaction with life scale; NAU = authority; NSS = self-sufficiency; NSP = superiority; NEX = exhibitionism; NEP = exploitativeness; NV = vanity; NEN = entitlement; SK = self-kindness; SJ = self-judgment; CH = common humanity; IS = isolation; MI = mindfulness; OI = overidentification.

*p<.05. **p<.01.

Table 8

Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation

Item	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4
		Loadings		
When confronted with my mistakes, my first response is to explain why I did it. (Reverse scored [R])	.72			
When I get in trouble, it is important to me to be able to explain what happened. (R)	.78			
I am usually quick to rationalize my failures. (R)	.54			
When I have put myself out for another, I want them to acknowledge my sacrifice. (R)		.74		
When someone else is being recognized, I think about my accomplishments. (R)		.68		
It frustrates me when others are praised and I am not. (R)		.75		
The challenges ahead of me often cause me to feel overwhelmed.			.43	
I don't have my act together the way I'd like.			.79	
Recently, I have felt ashamed of my arrogance.			.60	
I often wish I was as talented as my peers.			.73	
I feel honored when others ask for my help.				.50
I am deeply touched when others sacrifice for me.				.66
I feel valuable doing "lowly" things for others.				.77

Table 9

Correlations Among Humility Subscales and other measures (Study 1)

Measure	OP	SF	MS	OF	HUM
R10	.00	-.10	.13	.25*	.09
SWB	-.08	.03	-.35**	.03	-.20*
SPW	-.11	-.10	-.16	.08	-.13
RMS	.05	.24*	.16	.12	.20*
FMS	-.03	-.04	.15	.27**	.09
NAU	-.07	.20*	-.22*	-.02	-.05
NSS	-.12	.05	-.25**	-.14	-.17
NSP	-.02	.18	-.17	-.03	.00
NEH	-.08	.30**	-.18*	-.07	-.02
NEP	.06	.14	.01	-.13	.05
NVA	.02	.18	-.15	-.09	-.01
NEN	-.10	.26**	-.08	-.09	.00
EMP	.29**	.32**	.38**	.50**	.51**

Humility subscales: OP = openness; SF = self-forgetfulness; MS = modest self-assessment; OF = focus on others; HUM = total 13-item humility score; R10 = religious commitment; SWB = satisfaction with life scale; SPW = spiritual well-being; RMS = religious maturity; FMS = faith maturity; NPI subscales: NAU = authoritative; NSS = self-sufficiency; NSP = superiority; NEH = exhibitionism; NEP = exploitativeness; NVA = vanity; NEN = entitlement; EMP = empathy.
*p<.05. **p<.01.

Table 10

Correlations Among Humility Subscales and other measures (Study 2)

Measure	OP	SF	MS	OF	HUM
R10	-.12	-.02	.00	.33**	.13
SWB	-.16	-.11	-.30**	.11	-.23*
NAU	-.03	.02	-08	.05	-.03
NSS	-.23*	-.08	-.19	-.18	-.26*
NSP	.11	.25*	-.17	.04	.06
NEH	.09	.26*	.02	.00	.15
NEP	-.02	.07	.10	.04	.09
NVA	.02	.17	-.20	-.03	-.04
NEN	.18	.20	-.04	-.16	.12
PWB	.00	-.16	-.41**	.30**	-.19
FP	.21	-.09	-.05	.35**	.11
PES	.04	-.32**	.04	-.25*	-.11
SES	.04	.04	-.58**	.13	-.27*
LON	.17	.21	.45**	-.10	.35**
EMP	.34**	.26*	.27*	.47**	.50**

Humility subscales: OP = openness; SF = self-forgetfulness; MS = modest self-assessment; OF = focus on others; HUM = total 13-item humility score; NPI subscales: NAU = authoritative; NSS = self-sufficiency; NSP = superiority; NEH = exhibitionism; NEP = exploitativeness; NVA = vanity; NEN = entitlement; R10 = religious commitment; SWB = satisfaction with life scale; PWB = Ryff's psychological well-being scale; SES = self-esteem; LON = loneliness; EMP = empathy.
*p<.05. **p<.01.

Table 11

Correlations Among Humility, Self-Compassion and Narcissistic Personality Subscales (Study 3)

Measure	OP	SF	MS	OF	HUM
R10	-.14	.02	.33	.34**	.32**
SWB	.02	.14	-.23*	.02	-.07
NAU	.00	-.02	-.29**	-.07	-.23*
NSS	.01	.02	-.20	-.16	-.19
NSP	.07	-.19	-.01	-.08	-.10
NEH	-.12	-.30**	.08	-.24*	-.24*
NEP	.06	-.17	-.18	-.43**	-.35**
NVA	-.04	-.23*	-.21	-.23*	-.36**
NEN	.05	-.30**	-.11	-.45**	-.38**
SK	-.09	-.06	-.20	-.02	-.21
SJ	-.06	.21	-.35**	-.11	-.21
CH	-.24*	.13	-.08	.32**	.04
IS	-.02	-.20	.20	.17	.11
MI	-.19	.01	-.18	.25*	-.09
OI	.04	.14	-.26*	.14	-.04

Humility subscales: OP = openness; SF = self-forgetfulness; MS = accurate self-assessment; OF = focus on others; HUM = total 13-item humility score; R10 = religious commitment; SWB = satisfaction with life; Self-compassion subscales: SK = self-kindness; SJ = self-judgment; CH = common humanity; IS = isolation; MI = mindfulness; OI = overidentification; NPI subscales: NAU = authoritative; NSS = self-sufficiency; NSP = superiority; NEH = exhibitionism; NEP = exploitativeness; NVA = vanity; NEN = entitlement.
*p<.05. **p<.01.

APPENDIX B

32-item Humility Scale

*These items were deleted during the Principal Component Analysis.

Please circle the response that most accurately describes you.

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3=Uncertain
4=Agree
5=Strongly Agree

*1.When it seems like God is ignoring my prayers, I become frustrated.   1   2   3   4   5

*2. I enjoy spending time reflecting on the majesty and power of nature.   1   2   3   4   5

*3. It is easy for me to accept the honest criticism of a friend.   1   2   3   4   5

*4. When asked I can give an accurate assessment of my personal strengths.   1   2   3   4   5

*5. I often spend time thinking about my personal inadequacies.   1   2   3   4   5

6. When I have put myself out for another, I want them to

acknowledge my sacrifice.   1   2   3   4   5

*7. I often feel bad for wanting more, when so many have less than me.   1   2   3   4   5

8. The challenges ahead of me often cause me to feel overwhelmed.   1   2   3   4   5

*9. When asked to do something, I usually think of others who are

more qualified.   1   2   3   4   5

*10. During times of prayer/meditation, I reflect on areas in my life

 where I need improvement.   1   2   3   4   5

11. When someone else is being recognized, I think about my accomplishments. 1   2   3   4   5

12. I feel honored when others ask for my help.   1   2   3   4   5

*13. I often struggle with being selfish.   1   2   3   4   5

*14. Compared to the greatness and vastness of the universe, I feel

so insignificant.   1   2   3   4   5

15. It frustrates me, when others are praised and I am not.   1   2   3   4   5

16. I don't have my act together the way I'd like.   1   2   3   4   5

17. Recently, I have felt ashamed of my arrogance.   1   2   3   4   5

18. I often wish I was as talented as my peers.   1   2   3   4   5

*19. When I don't know an answer, I get upset because I think I should have.   1   2   3   4   5

*20. I get angry with know-it-alls.   1   2   3   4   5

*21. When I see inspiring examples, it reminds me of what I could be.   1   2   3   4   5

22. When confronted with my mistakes, my first response is to explain why

 I did it.   1   2   3   4   5

23. I am deeply touched when others sacrifice for me.   1   2   3   4   5

*24. It is hard for me to accept others' praise because I am far from perfect.   1   2   3   4   5

*25. It irritates me when people below me don't fulfill their responsibilities.   1   2   3   4   5

26. I feel valuable doing "lowly" things for others.   1   2   3   4   5

*27. When friends ask for my counsel, I feel like "why me"?   1   2   3   4   5

28. When I get in trouble, it is important to me to be able to explain what

 happened.   1   2   3   4   5

*29. I try to downplay my part when I help others.   1   2   3   4   5

*30. Death usually reminds me how needy I am.   1   2   3   4   5

*31. When I have been confronted with the reality of death, it causes me to think

how quickly life passes by.   1   2   3   4   5

32. I am usually quick to rationalize my failures.   1   2   3   4   5

(Reverse score items: 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32)

60-item Humility Scale

Please circle the response that most accurately describes you.

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3=Uncertain
4=Agree
5=Strongly Agree

1. When waiting in a checkout line, I am usually impatient.   1   2   3   4   5

2. After trying several times to accomplish a task, if I am still unsuccessful,
I will usually stop trying.   1   2   3   4   5

3. It is important to me in my serving God, that I receive His divine rewards.   1   2   3   4   5

4. When it seems like God is ignoring my prayers, I become frustrated.   1   2   3   4   5

5. When I have offended someone, I am usually the first to apologize.   1   2   3   4   5

6. I enjoy spending time reflecting on the majesty and power of nature.   1   2   3   4   5

7. I sometimes wonder how I have made it through the challenges of life.   1   2   3   4   5

8. It is easy for me to accept the honest criticism of a friend.   1   2   3   4   5

9. I have often pondered my "smallness" in the face of the universe.   1   2   3   4   5

10. I look for opportunities to praise others.   1   2   3   4   5

11. When asked I can give an accurate assessment of my personal strengths.   1   2   3   4   5

12. When asked I can give an accurate assessment of my personal weakness.   1   2   3   4   5

13. I often spend time thinking about my personal inadequacies.   1   2   3   4   5

14. It is hard for me to relate to people who are "needy."   1   2   3   4   5

15. When I have put myself out for another, I want them to

acknowledge my sacrifice.   1   2   3   4   5

16. I enjoy being recognized for my accomplishments.   1   2   3   4   5

17. I feel uncomfortable being the "center of attention."   1   2   3   4   5

18. O often help those who are less fortunate than I am.   1   2   3   4   5

19. When some else makes a mistake, I am quick to think that I could just

as easily failed.   1   2   3   4   5

20. When I forgive someone, its usually because I know of my

own need of forgiveness.   1   2   3   4   5

21. At work, it is easy for me to ask for help. 1 2 3 4 5

22. I often feel bad for wanting more, when so many have less than me. 1 2 3 4 5

23. The challenges ahead of me often cause me to feel overwhelmed. 1 2 3 4 5

24. When asked to do something, I usually think of others who are more

qualified. 1 2 3 4 5

25. During times of prayer/meditation, I reflect on areas in my life

 where I need improvement. 1 2 3 4 5

26. When someone else is being recognized, I think about my

accomplishments. 1 2 3 4 5

27. I feel very small in God's presence. 1 2 3 4 5

28. I am impressed when a person displays a quiet, and meek attitude. 1 2 3 4 5

29. I am filled with a sense of awe when I am able to help others. 1 2 3 4 5

30. I feel honored when others ask for my help. 1 2 3 4 5

31. I often struggle with being selfish. 1 2 3 4 5

32. When some is blatantly wrong, I like to "put them in their place." 1 2 3 4 5

33. It is hard for me to accept a gift, if I feel I don't deserve it. 1 2 3 4 5

34. I like the feeling of being a part of a team. 1 2 3 4 5

35. Compared to the greatness and vastness of the universe, I feel so

insignificant. 1 2 3 4 5

36. It frustrates me, when others are praised and I am not. 1 2 3 4 5

37. I am very grateful when others forgive me, and are willing to continue

 the relationship. 1 2 3 4 5

38. I enjoy the feeling of being "in control" of the situation. 1 2 3 4 5

39. It is easy for to laugh at myself when I make a mistake. 1 2 3 4 5

40. I don't have my act together the way I'd like. 1 2 3 4 5

41. Recently, I have felt ashamed of my arrogance. 1 2 3 4 5

42. It is easy for me to be submissive toward others. 1 2 3 4 5

43. I feel valuable in the eyes of God. 1 2 3 4 5

44. I often wish I was as talented as my peers. 1 2 3 4 5

45. When I don't know an answer, I get upset because I think I should have. 1 2 3 4 5

46. I get angry with know-it-alls. 1 2 3 4 5

47. When I see inspiring examples, it reminds me of what I could be. 1 2 3 4 5

48. When confronted with my mistakes, my first response is to explain

 why I did it. 1 2 3 4 5

49. I am deeply touched when others sacrifice for me. 1 2 3 4 5

50. It is difficult for me to let others do things for me that I can do myself. 1 2 3 4 5

51. It is hard for me to accept others' praise because I am far from perfect. 1 2 3 4 5

52. It irritates me when people below me don't fulfill their responsibilities. 1 2 3 4 5

53. I feel valuable doing "lowly" things for others. 1 2 3 4 5

54. When receiving a compliment, I usually think how fortunate I am. 1 2 3 4 5

55. When friends ask for my counsel, I feel like "why me"? 1 2 3 4 5

56. When I get in trouble, it is important to me to be able to explain what

happened. 1 2 3 4 5

57. I try to downplay my part when I help others. 1 2 3 4 5

58. Death usually reminds me how needy I am. 1 2 3 4 5

59. When I have been confronted with the reality of death, it causes me

to think how quickly life passes by. 1 2 3 4 5

60. I am usually quick to rationalize my failures. 1 2 3 4 5

VITA

     Jeffrey Charles Elliott was born on December 4, 1962, in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. He married Penny Christensen on July 25, 1987, and they have three children: Jessica, 19, Janette, 19, and Aaron, 14. He received a Bachelor of Science degree in History from Iowa State University in 1985. He also received a Master of Divinity in Pastoral Studies in 1989 from Temple Baptist Seminary and a Master of Arts in Educational and Counseling Psychology in 1995 from the University of Missouri. He currently serves as the Director of Student Development and Assistant Professor of Psychology at Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, TN. He was voted Teacher of the Year in 2003 and 2008 by the student body of TTU.